DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 045 SO 019 250

AUTHOR Rutkowski, Edward, Ed.
TITLE Papers and Proceedings of the Midwest History of Education Society Annual Meeting (16th, Chicago, Illinois, October 24-25, 1980).
INSTITUTION Midwest History of Education Society, Cedar Falls, IA.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 201p.; For related documents, see SO 019 242-257.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society; v9 1981

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alcohol Education; Catholic Schools; *Educational Facilities Planning; *Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Educational Principles; Experimental Colleges; Football; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; High School Students; Parent Background; Politics; Social Theories; Socioeconomic Status; Universities

ABSTRACT

The papers in this document present three themes: history of higher education; educational thought; and education and reform. "The University of Illinois' Long Search for a Permanent Campus in Chicago, 1946-1963: The Relationship between the Politics of Influence and the Conflicting Images of an Urban University" (G. A. Sprague) begins part 1 and describes the university's site selection, the mission of the Chicago branch, the concerns from other universities, and the lack of political support. "Between Two Worlds: The Residential College at the University of Michigan" (M. C. Hathaway) presents the four periods of the Residential College's history. "Maroon Farewell: The Abolition of Intercollegiate Football at the University of Chicago" (S. S. Cohen) tells of the team's final games and the press coverage of its demise. Part 2 begins with "William Rainey Harper: Christian Individualism and the University of Chicago" (D. B. Owen) which tries to uncover Harper's philosophy and how he applied it to the University. "Deschooling Revisited: An Examination of Ivan Illich's Social Thought" (T. Reagan) distinguishes between the medieval ideal of human society and New Liberalism and examines how Illich's social theory reflected the ideal in his critique of schooling. "John Lancaster Spalding: The Horace Mann of Catholic Education" (R. N. Barger) describes Spalding's involvement in establishing Illinois' parochial schools, the Catholic Educational Exhibit, the Baltimore Cathecism, The Catholic University of America, and the Institute of Pedagogy. Part 3 begins with "The WCTU and Education: Canadian-American Illustrations" (N. M. Sheehan) that describes the American Women's Christian Temperance Union's public school arm, the Department of Scientific Temperance Instruction, and compares its efforts to include the teaching of temperance through textbooks, and its ultimate failure, to similar efforts in Canada. "The Matter of Means: The Campaign and Election for the New York Free Academy, 1846-1847" (J. Mirel) describes the political controversy over the establishment of the Free Academy. "A Note on the Occupational Backgrounds of Public High School Students Prior to 1940" (D. L. Angus) reviews the 19th and early 20th century literature written about parental occupations. The conference program, business meeting's minutes, and attendance are included. (DJC)

ED298045

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
EDWARD RUTKOWSKI
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Volume 9, 1981

Contents include papers by:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Gregory A. Sprague
Marlene Hathaway
Sheldon S. Cohen
David B. Owen
Timothy Reagan
Robert Newton Barger
Nancy M. Sheehan
Jeffery Mirel
David L. Angus

also, the proceedings of the sixteenth meeting

Published by the
Department of Educational Psychology
and Foundations
College of Education — University of
Northern Iowa

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Distributed and Published for the Society by the
Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations
College of Education — University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, Iowa

Copyright 1981 by the Midwest History
of Education Society
Edited by
Edward Rutkowski

Any subscriptions or inquiries should be sent to:

Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society
Education Center, Room 513
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Volume 9, 1981

Contents include papers by:

Gregory A. Sprague
Marlene Hathaway
Sheldon S. Cohen
David B. Owen
Timothy Reagan
Robert Newton Barger
Nancy M. Sheehan
Jeffery Mirel
David L. Angus

also, the proceedings of the sixteenth meeting

Published by the
Department of Educational Psychology
and Foundations
College of Education — University of
Northern Iowa

Distributed and Published for the Society by the
Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations
College of Education — University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, Iowa

Copyright 1981 by the Midwest History
of Education Society
Edited by
Edward Rutkowski

Any subscriptions or inquiries should be sent to:

Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society
Education Center, Room 513
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Editor's Foreword

It is our great pleasure to present to the reader the papers and proceedings of the sixteenth meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society. The papers in the following text represent the maturity and progress which the Society has achieved on its way well into the second decade of its existence. This edition also marks the ninth volume of our journal. James Carper is to be congratulated for bringing to us such an excellent and varied program. The scholarship displayed, the diversity of presentations, and the cosmopolitan flavor of the participants made for an exhilarating event for all who attended.

Nevertheless, it was with great sadness that the Society was to learn of the recent death of Rosemary Donatelli of the Loyola University faculty. As a special tribute we wish to dedicate this volume to her memory, for she more than anyone represented the unfailing dedication and constant attention to planning a unique group such as ours needs in order to continue. Our past president and one of our charter members, Robert Belding, expresses for us in his eulogy our genuine regard for our friend and colleague.

We want to again express our appreciation to the good people at Loyola University. To Dean Gutek, his faculty and staff, we offer our deepest thanks for carrying on so well and acting as such fine hosts. To the University of Northern Iowa, this editor extends his gratitude and that of the Society for the continued support of this important academic activity. The editor offers his special thanks to all the staff and faculty at his institution, too numerous to mention, who with their dedication toward scholarship and craftsmanship are constantly helping to improve the quality of this publication.

Edward Rutkowski

Editor

Eulogy for Rosemary Donatelli

Those of us who have been generously hosted over the years by Loyola University in Chicago for our annual Midwest History of Education meetings remember Rosemary for her reliably warm welcome, greeting each of us by name at the meeting's registration desk. Beyond that entry portal she was an active contributor of bright and relevant papers and a lively questioner of others' papers. "Extramurally" she answered professional letters from us with dispatch. Overall she was an essential spark and fire which has illuminated our cherished contact with Loyola and its enduring hospitality to our group.

As a mobile and adaptable individual, Rosemary Donatelli spent her life in three major environments. She was reared in Chicago where she received her Bachelor's degree in music from Mundelein College, then taught school in New York state while pursuing her Master's in music from Columbia University. She returned to Chicago in 1957 to join the Loyola faculty while advancing toward her Ph.D. degree in educational history at the University of Chicago.

Her most worldly professional contact and contribution was in Rome, Italy, where she pioneered in teaching at Loyola University's Center of Liberal Arts. She returned frequently to perpetuate her teaching there.

Rosemary's specialty, of course, was educational history, although she also taught in comparative education. Her academic interests embraced all aspects of educational foundations, for she remained active in the Midwest Philosophy of Education Society (most recently serving on its Executive Committee), our Midwest History of Education Society (where she was devoted Secretary, Vice President, then President), and nationally in the Comparative Education Society, the Philosophy of Education Society, the History of Education Society and the all-embracing American Educational Studies Association. Her memberships and contributions also included Phi Delta Kappa, the National Society for the Study of Education, and the Society for Professors of Education.

While serving Loyola University she chaired several doctoral dissertations and headed the Educational Foundations Department for four years. Recently she has served on four administrative committees for the University. Her contributions to professional journals, such as the *Comparative Education Review*, were not only impressive but were solidly readable and helpful.

Rosemary's associates and students at Loyola will remember her for her sensitivity as an outstanding teacher, a competent administrator, and a valued and respected colleague. Without her presence there will be a continual void at our October meetings of the Midwest History of Education Society.

CONTENTS

PART I
HISTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS' LONG SEARCH FOR A PERMANENT CAMPUS IN CHICAGO 1946-1963: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE POLITICS OF INFLUENCE AND THE CONFLICTING IMAGES OF AN URBAN UNIVERSITY
by Gregory A. Sprague, Loyola University of Chicago 2

BETWEEN TWO WORLDS: THE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
by Marlene Hathaway, The University of Michigan 25

MAROON FAREWELL: THE ABOLITION OF INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
by Sheldon S. Cohen, Loyola University of Chicago 42

PART II
EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER: CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALISM AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
by David B. Owen, The University of Chicago 60

DESCHOOLING REVISITED: AN EXAMINATION OF IVAN ILLICH'S SOCIAL THOUGHT
by Timothy Reagan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 80

JOHN LANCASTER SPALDING: THE HORACE MANN OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION
by Robert Newton Barger, Eastern Illinois University 92

PART III
EDUCATION AND REFORM

THE WCTU AND EDUCATION: CANADIAN-AMERICAN ILLUSTRATIONS
by Nancy M. Sheehan, The University of Calgary 115

THE MATTER OF MEANS: THE CAMPAIGN AND ELECTION FOR THE NEW YORK FREE ACADEMY, 1846-1847
by Jeffrey Mirel, The University of Michigan 134

A NOTE ON THE OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS PRIOR TO 1940
by David L. Angus, The University of Michigan .....

PART IV
PROGRAM AND PROCEEDINGS

OFFICIAL PROGRAM 158

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING 188

DIRECTORY OF ATTENDANCE 190

PART I

History of Higher Education

The University of Illinois' Long Search for a Permanent Campus in Chicago 1946-1963: The Relationship Between the Politics of Influence and the Conflicting Images of an Urban University

Gregory A. Sprague
Loyola University of Chicago

When the University of Illinois was established at Champaign-Urbana as a land-grant college in 1867, there was an attempt to establish a Chicago branch (the Mechanical Arts College) by the first Board of Trustees; but due to political in-fighting within Cook County, the Chicago campus did not materialize in the 1860's.[1] It was not until February, 1965, almost a century later, that a permanent, four-year, degree granting campus of the University of Illinois opened its doors in the city of Chicago. Except for the medical campus of the University of Illinois and the Chicago Teachers' College, there was no public degree granting institution of higher education in Chicago until 1965. Due to public pressure and an influx of veterans with GI educational benefits after World War II, the Board of Trustees did establish a temporary two-year Chicago branch of the University of Illinois (U. of I.) at Navy Pier in 1946. Navy Pier is literally a pier which extends five-eighths of a mile into Lake Michigan. The Pier has been used as a dock, a naval training school, a traffic court, an amusement park, convention and exhibition hall and college campus. Mayor Edward Kelly of Chicago offered Navy Pier as a temporary campus to U. of I. on a three-year lease. But instead of occupying Navy Pier for a three-year period, the Chicago campus found itself on the Pier for the total of seventeen years.

The learning environment at the Pier could be at best be called inadequate. Crowded makeshift classrooms, labs, offices, cafeteria, lounges and locker space were all squeezed into one portion of Navy Pier. Noise, from other parts of the Pier due to construction or the unloading of ships, often became unbearable.[2] Along with the concerns over crowded conditions, noise, inadequate classrooms and the general lack of a proper environment, the faculty and students were also unhappy with the limitations of a two-year curriculum which was placed upon the Chicago campus by the Champaign-Urbana administration. Students at Navy Pier could only take freshman and sophomore-level courses. In order to complete their baccalaureate degrees, they would have to continue their course work for two more years at Champaign-Urbana. The cost of living

away from home and attending U. of I. at Champaign-Urbana often prevented many students at the Chicago Division from continuing their studies, especially those who had to help support a family or who came from a poor family. Thus, it was only natural for the students at the Pier to be constant agitators for a new campus site which would make it possible to institute a four-year curriculum.

The University authorities at Champaign-Urbana were adamant about not expanding the two-year curriculum at the Pier until a permanent campus site could be found. This reluctance can be seen in an early report (1954) of one of the several University committees created to explore the expansion problems of the Chicago Undergraduate Division:

> Until University-owned facilities are available, the present two-year program in Chicago should be continued. To develop advance work in the present facilities on Navy Pier will certainly mean that freshman admission will have to be limited within a very few years. . . . The evidence on economic status, cost, and academic history of students now attending the Chicago Undergraduate Division at Navy Pier does not in itself indicate an urgent need for expansion to a four-year program within the next few years.[3]

The faculty and administrators at the Pier were often at odds with Champaign-Urbana on this issue. They were quite anxious to expand the curriculum even without a new campus site. A 1953 faculty petition to the Board of Trustees advocated the expansion of the curriculum into a four-year curriculum before finding a permanent campus.[4] Naturally, the faculty at the Pier felt for the students' predicament, but they were also concerned about their own professional status which was diminished by teaching in a low-prestige, two-year, non-degree granting institution.

The conflict of interests between the Navy Pier campus and the Champaign-Urbana campus was only one of the many conflicts of interest which directly or indirectly affected the long and complex site selection process for a permanent campus. Gene Burd, a journalist, in his dissertation on the Chicago press and the site selection process summed up concisely the full range of the conflicting interests which determined the 17-year search for the permanent campus site:

> The search for a permanent campus for the University in Chicago almost inevitably involved controversy. The clash of self-interest, the shuffle of power positions, the compromises in policies and philosophies and the resulting re-alignments opened old sores. . . . The solution to the civic problems met head-on with the sectional interests of the area: Chicago, Downstate, Cook County, other counties, the suburbs, separate city neighborhoods, hundreds of civic clubs, the University of Illinois, Central City interests, residen-

tial communities in the city and suburbs, the city planners, the intellectually diverse, scattered and unorganized citizenry, the politicians and political parties, and the press, labor, and other educational institutions.[5]

In theory, it was the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois which was to make the final decision on where the permanent campus was to be built. But their decision could not be made in isolation and had to take into account the economic, social and political realities of the city of Chicago and the state of Illinois in the 1950's and early 1960's. The Board had to reverse itself four times before finally hitting upon a site which was acceptable to both the University and the city of Chicago.

The criteria were devised by the Board in order to determine the most suitable site for the Chicago campus. The criteria included accessibility, availability, expansibility, costs and environment.[6] The campus site had to be accessible by public transportation, and was to be within the maximum of one hour travel time from the homes of at least 50 percent of the potential students residing in Cook and DuPage counties. The site had to be available for the University to purchase and make ready for construction in the shortest period of time. The site was to allow for the physical expansion of the campus in the future. The costs for the land and the buildings had to be within the limits set by the Illinois General Assembly. And, of course, the environment of the site was quite important: "Sites adjacent to environmental factors which would assist the educational mission of the campus are to be preferred over sites with neutral or unfavorable environmental surroundings."[7]

But what "environmental factors" would assist in the educational mission of such a public urban university? And more important, what was to be the educational mission of a public urban university in Chicago? These are the key questions which had to be answered, sometime, by all those involved in the long decision-making process: the trustees, the president of U. of I., University administrators, faculty and students, the mayor of Chicago and other influential politicians. And how they answered these questions was a major determinant of where the University was to be located. The "environmental factors" were naturally derived from the decision-makers' conception of the educational mission and corresponding image of a public urban university.

Since the public urban university in the United States is a fairly modern phenomenon, the general image of a public urban university in the 1950's was still quite blurred and very much clouded by the rural images of the classical American college. Unlike most European universities which were firmly rooted in an urban milieu, American colleges and universities were closely tied to the countryside and became an important part of the "agrarian myth" of American history. Frederick Rudolph, a historian of American higher education, emphasized the great influence of this

"agrarian myth" on higher education in the United States:

> But everywhere there lingered the belief that life was sounder, more moral, more character-building where the college was nestled among the hills or planted on the prairies. Supporting this belief was the attachment of the American people to an agrarian myth, to a view of the world that saw the land as source of virtue and as the great moving force in history. . . . The country-college tradition — either in the country colleges themselves or in the romantic efforts to simulate the country colleges in the city — reinforced the agrarian myth. . . . But whatever else it has done, the country-college tradition has testified to the tremendous strength, the remarkable persistence of the collegiate way in the history of American higher education.[8]

Rudolph saw the country-college tradition as only one aspect of the "collegiate way" of American higher education. "The collegiate way is the notion that a curriculum, a library, a faculty, and student are not enough to make a college. It is an adherence to the residential scheme of things. It is respectful of quiet rural settings, dependent on dormitories, committed to dining halls, permeated by paternalism. It is what every American college has had or consciously rejected or lost or sought to recapture."[9] An urban university (which does not adhere to "the residential scheme of things," is not "dependent on dormitories," not "committed to dining halls" and rarely exists in "quiet rural settings"), appeared to many educators in higher education as being out of step with the idealized American collegiate tradition.

The mission of an urban university in the 1950's was also somewhat vague and ill-defined. The debate over the mission of the Chicago branch of the University of Illinois was illustrative of this problem. The educational mission of the Chicago campus would naturally determine the most favorable factors which would assist the University with the achievement of its mission. During the 1950's, an internal debate within the University of Illinois did take place over the mission of the Chicago campus. The faculty and administration at Champaign-Urbana tended to prefer a university where "neither the institution nor the metropolitan area has become significantly dependent on each other."[10] Champaign-Urbana wanted the Chicago campus to be primarily preoccupied "with the intellectual life and with the allocation of resources on behalf of the fundamental fields of learning" and not with "the needs of the community in which it is located."[11] Basically, the Champaign-Urbana faculty and administrators "drew no functional distinctions between a university located in the heart of an agricultural area more than one hundred miles distant from the complexities of Chicago, and a university located at the very center of those urban complexities."[12]

The administrators and faculty at Navy Pier advocated an alternate

concept of the urban university. They saw the needs of the university "intertwined with the community life" of the city.[13] The Committee on Curricular Expansion of the Chicago Undergraduate Division reported that the Chicago campus should be "nothing less than a complete full-scale autonomously operated university" which "can fulfill the accumulated needs of the Chicago area" and "be flexible enough to meet the changing needs of a community as dynamic as Chicago."[14] The Navy Pier faculty were concerned that the Chicago campus might be tied too closely to Champaign-Urbana, thus the Chicago campus would not be allowed to serve the urban needs of the city.

In December 1960, a clear statement of the mission of the Chicago Undergraduate Division was finally drawn up by the University. This statement of mission seemed to be a validation of the concept of an urban university which was advocated by the Navy Pier faculty and administrators: "The fundamental purpose of the University in establishing a new center of higher education in Chicago is to bring to a metropolitan area . . . a broad range of educational benefits which an established state university of high quality can best provide promptly and effectively."[15] The more specific aims of the Chicago campus corresponded closely to the urban model: "To help the Chicago area meet the acute demand for undergraduate education due to population increases. . . . To give Chicago a publicly-supported institution offering degree programs in most of the fields of knowledge included in the humanities, arts, and sciences, as well as in those professions primarily related to the culture of an urban community. . . . To develop an institution of higher education uniquely designed to meet the special needs of a rapidly-changing metropolitan community. . . . To encourage the cultivation of the rich resources of the metropolitan area for cultural, social, economic, and scientific-technical education."[16]

By December 1960, the Board of Trustees had already chosen the site for the campus four times and was about to pick a fifth and final site for the Chicago campus of U. of I. without a clear statement of the mission of the Chicago branch. The complex politics of Chicago had prevented the Trustees from building a campus on their first four sites. But just the process of making a choice of a campus site without a clear statement of the mission of the Chicago campus from the University suggests that the Trustees had already determined their own conception of this mission; and thus they proceeded from their own conception of the educational mission and their corresponding image of an urban university in choosing the desirable environmental factors for the Chicago campus. And, up to 1960, the majority of the trustees had a non-urban conception of the mission of the Chicago campus and their corresponding physical image of the campus was closely tied to the "collegiate tradition." Burd clearly saw this during his investigation of the site selection process: "The university trustees wanted a 'local,' isolated, pastoral, rural-like, typical Midwestern pastoral campus, rather than the urban skyscraper in the

midst of the towers of commerce and trade and the hustle and noise of the central metropolis."[17] Thus the long process of selecting a site for the Chicago campus involved not only the conflict of many interest groups in Chicago and Illinois and their battle to influence the final site decision, but also a conflict of visions on what an urban university should be and should do.

A History of the Site Selection Process for the Chicago Campus

Before proceeding to an analysis of the relationship between the decision-makers' image of a public university in the Chicago area and where they wanted the campus to be located, a brief history of the whole site selection process is necessary.

Shortly after the establishment of a temporary campus of the U. of I. in Chicago (1946), a campaign was begun by the students and faculty at Navy Pier and their supporters in the city of Chicago to find a permanent campus and to extend the curriculum to four years. But their campaign was met with opposition from several quarters.

The private colleges and universities in the Chicago area naturally opposed the competition which a four-year degree granting public institution would pose for them. Northwestern University and the University of Chicago, which had much higher tuition costs and took most of their students from outside of the city, were not as vulnerable as the Catholic universities of DePaul and Loyola, nor Roosevelt University, a private commuter college.[18] U. of I. administrators were constantly trying to quiet fears of those private colleges and universities so that U. of I.'s plans for a permanent branch in Chicago would not be blocked by their influence.

Until 1953, major opposition came from the University of Illinois itself. The administrators at Champaign-Urbana were concerned that a permanent Chicago campus would threaten the favored position which the Champaign-Urbana campus held in the university system in Illinois. They feared that the limited resources granted to the U. of I. divided two ways would reduce the quality education at Champaign-Urbana. With half of the population of Illinois living in the Chicago metropolitan area and with the General Assembly representation reflecting this demographic fact, the University was also worried that a majority block of state legislators would vote to strengthen the Chicago branch at the expense of the Champaign-Urbana branch. This fear of competition from the Chicago campus was expressed by Charles C. Caveny, dean of Navy Pier and the major advocate of a permanent four-year Chicago campus: "From top to bottom, the administrators at Urbana-Champaign were afraid they would become a whistle-stop. I was poison ivy."[19] But in 1953 when Comptroller Lloyd Morey was appointed interim president of U. of I., the opposition to the Chicago campus dwindled. Morey was committed to

a permanent Chicago campus and began efforts to get a permanent campus for U. of I. in Chicago.

However, other groups associated with the U. of I. still opposed the permanent Chicago campus even after the Champaign-Urbana administration was won over to the idea. A group of alumni opposed an urban campus in Chicago perhaps because of their "sentimental attachment to the campus they had known." Leaders of this group of alumni feared that an urban campus "might give the University the reputation of being a 'poor boy's college' or above all a Negro's college."[20] And of course, the potential athletic competition from the Chicago campus also entered into the alumni opposition. The powerful merchants of Champaign-Urbana were also opposed to the Chicago campus because they feared that the Chicago campus would take students (i.e., customers) away from Champaign-Urbana and thus reduce their business.[21]

The downstate politicians, especially those tied closely to the interests of Champaign-Urbana such as State Senator Everette R. Peters (Republican) were not enthusiastic about a Chicago campus of U. of I. and made several attempts in the General Assembly to block the building of a permanent campus in Chicago.[22] This opposition reflected the continual political conflict between downstate and Chicago. Naturally the Republicans, who controlled most of downstate Illinois, did not want to see the Chicago Democrats gain such a political plum as a public institution of higher education. But in spite of this opposition, and due to the efforts of Chicago Democratic legislators such as State Representative Paul T. Randolph, the 67th General Assembly on May 10, 1950, did pass House Bill No. 108 which directed "the University of Illinois to establish and operate an undergraduate branch in the Chicago area and to award degrees." The General Assembly followed this legislation in 1953 with a bill that created a special commission to study the problems related to establishing a four-year campus of the U. of I. in Chicago, and which recommended in 1955 that there be established in Chicago a "full undergraduate division of the University not later than September, 1963."

By 1953, the U. of I., under President Morey, had become reconciled to the idea that a permanent four-year branch had to be built in the Chicago area. The predictions of increasing college enrollments within the next ten years, especially from the Chicago area, helped the University authorities come to this conclusion. In November, 1953, President Morey appointed a Committee on Future Development of the Chicago Undergraduate Division to study all problems involved in the development of a four-year undergraduate program in the Chicago area. In the following year, the Board of Trustees finally made a major move in the direction of finding a permanent campus in Chicago by hiring the Real Estate Research Corporation to help locate a suitable site for the campus.

The year 1955 was a turning point in the site selection process. Early in

1955, two men assumed positions of power who would be instrumental in determining the site of the Chicago campus. David Dodd Henry became president of the University of Illinois at the beginning of 1955. Richard J. Daley was elected Mayor of Chicago in April 1955, and became the "boss" of the Democratic machine in Chicago. Mayor Daley, at first, showed little interest in the site selection process. Until 1957, Daley was cautious about getting involved in the whole site location controversy, but after that date, Daley became more and more involved in the process. Finally, in 1960, it was his decision to place the Chicago campus in the Harrison-Halsted community that determined the site of the University of Illinois campus in Chicago. Unlike Daley, President Henry was immediately involved in the site controversy. Henry favored the expansion of both the Champaign-Urbana and Chicago branches.

President Henry's site recommendations for a Chicago campus held considerable weight with the Board of Trustees. The Trustees, who liked and respected Henry, felt that "he was in a better position than they to decide what was good for the University."[23] But the Trustees did have the final say and often took an active role in the selection process. A site selection committee was formed by the Board of Trustees and was chaired by Wayne A. Johnson, an influential member of the Board and president of the Illinois Central Railroad. With the Republicans having a 6 to 3 majority on the Board in 1955, Wayne Johnson, a Republican who had a highly respected position in the business world and a very assertive and powerful personality, naturally had a major say in any decision of the Board. Johnson at first opposed the four-year Chicago campus, but by the mid-1950's he was supporting a four-year campus. Cushman Bissel, a wealthy Republican lawyer from Chicago, and Mrs. Frances B. Watkins, a Chicago housewife and Democrat, were the other two trustees on the site selection committee. But Mrs. Watkins, as a person who lacked all business skills and experience, had little influence with the other trustees. Although not officially a member of the site selection committee, Park Livingston, chairman of the Board of Trustees, played an important role in the decision making process over the campus site. Since Livingston had been chairman of the Board for nine years and carried much political weight in the Republican Party, his views could not be ignored. Although all of the nine trustees would discuss the potential site locations and make the final decision, the recommendations by the site selection committee and Livingston were generally accepted by the whole Board.

On June 27, 1956, the Board of Trustees officially selected the first site for the Chicago branch of the University of Illinois. The site was Miller Meadows, a forest preserve located in the near-west suburbs of Chicago and controlled by the Cook County Forest Preserve District. The decision was made after Miller Meadows was listed as one of the highly recommended sites of the Real Estate Research Corporation and was recommended by the Committee on Future Development of the Chicago

Undergraduate Division in its interim report of March 29, 1956.

Miller Meadows easily met three of the five site criteria devised by the Trustees — expansibility, costs and environment. There was plenty of room for the expansion of a campus of the large forest preserve. Since the land was in the suburbs instead of the central city, the land was fairly cheap: 29 cents a foot, or $3 million.[24] The environment was quite pastoral and secluded and thus in tune with the "agrarian" and "collegiate" traditions in higher education. The site only partially met the criteria of accessibility. Miller Meadows did lie in the path of the future growth of the Chicago metropolitan area, but it was difficult to travel from some central city locations to Miller Meadows on public transportation.

But it was the criteria of availability that was the hardest to meet; in fact, in the case of Miller Meadows, it was never met. The Cook County Forest Preserve Commission and its non-partisan but powerful citizen Advisory Board were extremely protective of park land and resisted any attempts to remove park land from the public domain.[25] Although the University tried to influence the state legislature to pass legislation to release the park land for University use, the Forest Preserve District Commission with its close connections to the Democratic machine in Cook County resisted these efforts. In January 1957, the University gave up on the Miller Meadow site and in disgust, President Henry officially informed the Cook County and Chicago officials that it was now up to them to find a suitable campus site.[26]

With the temporary abdication of the site search by U. of I., Mayor Daley was somewhat forced into the site controversy. Soon after Henry's announcement, Daley met with his new city planning commissioner, Ira Bach, and with Dan Ryan, the president of the Cook County Board of Commissioners, in order to find a solution to the site selection problem. Daley, at first, made an attempt to work a compromise between Dan Ryan and his Forest Preserve District Commission and the University.[27] But soon Daley realized the potential political advantages of locating a major public university within the city limits of Chicago, especially if the site did not require the massive clearance and disruption of Chicago neighborhoods. After only two years as mayor, Daley was naturally concerned about large urban renewal projects which might affect Democratic voting patterns in the city and be potentially dangerous to Daley's chances for re-election in 1959.[28] There was opposition to mass slum clearance in many white neighborhoods because of earlier "clearance for public housing, which took place in Negro areas and forced them into white areas."[29] At this time, Daley was not yet known for his massive slum clearance projects and large-scale building programs.

But Daley saw a means to avoid this potential political disruption and keep the Chicago campus in the city. Since 1955, Daley had slowly been

working on a railroad terminal consolidation plan for the central area of the city in which City Hall would "try to persuade the railroads using Chicago's South Side to agree to help clear the railroad slums there by building a new consolidated passenger terminal."[30] Both Daley and Bach hoped that this consolidation of the railroad terminals would free up enough open land to build a permanent Chicago Campus of U. of I. By August 1958, with the release of the influential "Development Plan for the Central Area of Chicago," the city of Chicago was committed to the rail consolidation plan and the placement of the Chicago campus in the old railroad yards.[31]

A slum site for the Chicago campus had been suggested as early as 1956 by the Committee on Future Development. Along with Miller Meadows and three other sites, the Committee recommended a slum site north of the University of Illinois Medical Center on the West Side of Chicago. This site was strongly backed by Dr. Karl A. Meyer, director of the Medical Center and the former chairman of the University's Board of Trustees. Meyer wanted the new campus built next to the Medical Center in hopes of the campus becoming a barrier to the encroaching slums surrounding the Center. But even if President Henry and the trustees favored a slum site (which they didn't), the University could not afford such a site, since the University was only allocated $4 million by the General Assembly to buy a campus site. Four million dollars "would buy from 100 to 150 vacant, suburban acres, but a built-up area would be more expensive than they could afford."[32]

After the loss of Miller Meadows, the University requested that the Real Estate Research Corporation do another study of possible site locations for the Chicago campus. On October 23, 1958, the Real Estate Research Corporation released its re-study which recommended four sites: Riverside Golf Course, a suburban golf course very near Miller Meadows; Meigs Field, a small island airport on Lake Michigan near the Loop; Garfield Park, a public park located in a West Side Community of Chicago of the same name; and finally Daley's rail site. It also recommended that the University should *not* use a slum site for the campus because a campus could not be built and be in operation by the designated date of September 1963.[33]

In February 1959, the Board of Trustees once again became active in the site selection process. On February 19, the Board met and selected the Riverside Golf Course as the location for the new campus; but they also provided the option of using Meigs Field instead, if it was made available to the University by the Chicago Park District in 30 days. The Riverside Golf Course had many of the same advantages and disadvantages as Miller Meadows except it was not controlled by the Cook County Forest Preserve District. But the increased opposition of the suburban community surrounding the golf course and the city of Chicago to this

suburban site made its availability doubtful. Many whites in this suburban area feared the possible influx of blacks that the University might bring in: "Particularly in Riverside, an adjacent community, there was little enthusiasm for students. A large number of these could be black."[34] By February 1959, the Daley administration and other powerful interest groups in Chicago such as the daily newspapers were committed to an urban campus and opposed to a suburban campus. It was now a matter of civic pride.

The Board of Trustees had made its move and now Daley was to make his counter move. On the 23rd of February, Daley announced that the city of Chicago would defray the extra cost which would come about from selecting a Chicago site as compared with the cost of a suburban site such as the Riverside Golf Course. The Trustees were continually concerned about not alienating the Democratic legislators from Chicago, who often looked to Daley for leadership, because of their potential opposition to the future appropriations for the University of Illinois. Thus, out of respect for power held by the Chicago Democratic machine, the trustees met on March 12, and agreed to delay the site decision on the Riverside Golf Course. But at the same meeting, the trustees formally requested that the Chicago Park District allow the University to buy Meigs Field for the campus site. Meigs Field had always been the trustees' favorite site if they were to build the campus in Chicago.[35]

Richard J. Daley, who was re-elected mayor of Chicago on April 7, 1959, was now in a stronger position to deal with the University trustees and the whole site controversy. After five years of delay, the campus issue had reached a crisis point as the public pressure grew for a site decision. In fact, on election day, this public pressure could be seen when the Navy Pier students picketed City Hall demanding that Daley delay no longer and immediately find a permanent campus site.[36] On May 6, Daley informed the trustees that Meigs Field could not be used by the University because of commitments to the federal government, which had helped build the airport. Daley made little effort to negotiate with the federal government over these commitments because he was still pushing for the rail site. Influential businessmen had also opposed the abandonment of Meigs Field since many of them often used the airport for their own private planes.[37]

Frustrated once more in their choice, the Board of Trustees resisted Daley's choice of the rail site and on May 16, 1959, selected Garfield Park as the future campus of the Chicago Undergraduate Division of the University of Illinois. Since 1957, when the University gave up on Miller Meadows, the Chicago community of Garfield Park attempted to attract the Chicago campus to its large neighborhood park (54 acres) in hopes of stabilizing the area which had been slowly deteriorating since the 1940's. The community newspaper, the *Garfieldian*, led the fight for the campus. But the Garfield Park community and the University met with opposition

from two powerful interest groups. One was the Joint Action Committee of Civic Organizations which was a powerful coalition of Loop-oriented civic clubs formed May 22, 1959 (a week after the Garfield Park decision) in order to oppose the park site and promote the rail site as a way to revitalize the Loop. The Joint Action Committee had the money to finance a long fight in the courts against the park site. The other opponent of the park site was the Chicago Park District itself, which like the Cook County Forest Preserve, resisted attempts to use park land for non-recreational activities. Mayor Daley could have easily applied pressure on the Park Board to release the park land. But he was reluctant to do this; because the support of the park system in Chicago was a strong vote-getting issue for the Mayor, and Daley was still hoping to bring off the rail consolidation plan which would allow for a rail site campus.[38] With such opponents, the chances for the Garfield site were slight.

While the Garfield Park site was having major problems, Daley's rail terminal consolidation plan was also facing opposition. Daley was meeting major resistance to his plan from major railroads including the Rock Island Line and Wayne Johnston's Illinois Central which did not want to give up their own individual terminals around the Loop area. Daley had hopes of consolidating most of the railroad terminals so that there would be only one major terminal at Union Station on the West Side of the Loop. As negotiations over consolidations dragged on through the summer and fall of 1959, the mayor's planning advisers and the University officials became more and more pessimistic about the rail site becoming a reality.[39] The University had never been enthusiastic about the rail site. But for Daley, his terminal consolidation plan and rail campus had almost become an obsession.

When the Board of Trustees met on February 24, 1960, the trustees felt a great amount of public pressure on them to take direct action to settle this never-ending site controversy. During the meeting, the trustees reaffirmed their plan to open a new Chicago campus by 1963 which would accommodate 6,000 students, and concluded that it was too late to consider the railroad yards area as a feasible campus site, and formally requested a meeting with Mayor Daley in order to reach an agreement on the transfer of Garfield Park land to the University. On March 1, Daley met with President Henry and some members of the Board. Daley agreed that he would initiate negotiations with the Commissioners of the Park District to sell park land to the University. The Park District finally invited a legal suit to define the legal status of Garfield Park. On April 25, the legal proceedings over the park site were begun in the Circuit Court of Judge Cornelius Harrington. On August 26, 1960, Judge Harrington handed down his decision, which was an injunction barring the sale of park land to the University. Although the State Supreme Court reversed this decision on January 17, 1961, the University, by then, had abandoned the Garfield Park site.

In March 1960, all plans for the rail site campus collapsed when several major railroads failed to agree to remove their Dearborn Station trains to Union Station. This was the end of the city efforts to locate the Chicago campus at the rail site. On March 28, 1960, Mayor Daley dropped the rail campus from his Central Area Plan.

The Harrison-Halsted neighborhood, on the Near West Side not far from the Loop, was one area which was not recommended in any of the previous study reports for potential campus sites. In fact, the Real Estate Research Corporation's re-study had rejected all slum sites; the Harrison-Halsted site would be classified as a slum site. It was not until mid-1959 that the city seriously considered the area at Harrison-Halsted as a possible location for the Chicago campus. Daley's advisers (Land Clearance Commissioner Doyle, Conservation Commissioner MacKelman and the City Planning Commissioner Bach), were all influential in convincing Daley of the advantages of using the Harrison-Halsted site. During a trip to Washington, D.C., with Daley in the fall of 1959, Commissioner Doyle suggested the Harrison-Halsted site to Daley.

> We discussed . . . whether it would be possible to put the U. of I. in the Near West Side. . . . As I recall, it was Doyle who mentioned this. Something had to be done . . . it was a good location, near the expressway. . . . The Mayor's reaction was, 'It sounds like a good idea.'[40]

During the same conversation, the advantages of a commuter college located at Harrison-Halsted were also discussed, which included: "accessibility to students throughout the city who would live at home; proximity to the Loop for part-time employment, for libraries and other cultural facilities, and the campus as a magnet for employment, both during construction and afterward."[41]

If the campus was to be built at Harrison-Halsted, massive slum clearance of the neighborhood was necessary. Many thousands of people would lose their homes and be displaced from their community. Although a small urban renewal project had been underway in the community since the mid-1950's, its purpose was to revitalize and stabilize the old neighborhood, not to destroy a large portion of it and drastically change its composition. To many people in Chicago, including many in the Daley administration, the Harrison-Halsted community (also called "The Valley") was just a slum area.

"The Valley" had a long history as a port of entry for many immigrants coming to Chicago. By 1960, the neighborhood was a mixture of people of Italian, Greek, Mexican and Afro-American heritages. Jane Addams' famous Hull House was also located in the Harrison-Halsted community. Jane Addams began her settlement house in 1889 to serve the

vast needs of this immigrant community. To many in the community, Hull House was the vital heart of the community, and a national monument to the great works of Jane Addams. But in the initial plans for the campus, Hull House was in the center of the path of destruction. Only later, after a great deal of public outcry, did the University attempt to preserve Hull House.

By 1960, Daley had gained a national reputation as an urban renewal mayor. His earlier caution with urban renewal was gone. Under the Housing Act of 1949, Daley had utilized federal urban renewal money to clear slums on the South Side and replaced them with large housing projects, primarily for blacks. At the same time, he also began to promote his rebuilding program for the Loop area. Daley was determined to change the face of Chicago before he left the office of mayor. Thus, a proposed large-scale slum clearance program at Harrison and Halsted to build the Chicago campus was in tune with his general urban renewal policy. And by mid-1960, there was practically no alternative open to Daley. President Henry was once again threatening to move the campus to the suburbs.

On November 8, 1960, a very significant election took place which essentially paved the way for the conclusion to the long search for a permanent campus for the University of Illinois in Chicago. The voters of Illinois approved a higher education bond issue referendum which provided $50 million for the building of the Chicago campus. Daley's handpicked candidate Otto Kerner was also elected governor of Illinois, replacing Republican William Stratton who had opposed a slum site campus. Kerner would put up no opposition to the Harrison-Halsted site. The Democrats also retained their 6 to 3 majority on the Board of Trustees. (In 1958, the Democrats had won a majority on the Board.) The Democratic president of the Board of Trustees, Kenny Williamson (who replaced Park Livingston in 1959) was re-elected to the Board. Williamson was an open supporter of an inner city slum site. Thus the Democrats were in firm control of the Board, which naturally made the Board more receptive to Daley's wishes.

On the same evening that Kerner and Williamson won their electoral victories, so did a young Democratic senator from Massachusetts. John F. Kennedy, a close friend and supporter of Mayor Daley, was elected President of the United States (with a great deal of help from Daley in Illinois). Kennedy knew it was Dick Daley's efforts that won him the Illinois electoral votes which put him over the top. Kennedy's election quickly cleared away all barriers to the massive infusion of federal urban renewal funds into Chicago. Daley claimed that the Eisenhower Administration held back on urban renewal funds for Chicago. Kennedy assured Daley the federal funds necessary to clear the Harrison and Halsted site for the new campus.[42] The high cost of a clearance for a large slum site like Harrison and Halsted was no longer a problem.

On September 27, 1960, about one month before the election, Daley met with the trustees and other University officials in his office where he officially unveiled the Harrison-Halsted area as his proposed campus site. The Department of City Planning presented the proposal which included the promise that the "Chicago Land Clearance Commission has, or will have, adequate funds and staff to complete the land acquisition and clearance of the site within the time schedule . . . not later than July, 1963."[43] The trustees made no decision at that time. When the full impact of the November 8 elections was felt, and with the increasing public pressure for an immediate site, the University officials had no real choice but to accept Daley's choice. On February 15, 1961, the Board of Trustees met and selected the Harrison-Halsted site as the official site. They accepted the report of General Policy Committee (the site committee) which concluded "that the Harrison-Halsted Street site not only meets all criteria, but that it has the important plus factors of availability, accessibility, and offers an opportunity to contribute to a civic development in Chicago of major importance."[44] Daley had won. The city of Chicago was to have a four-year state institution of higher education.

The struggle over the site did not end with the Board's decision of February 15. Although the Chicago City Council approved the five ordinances necessary to locate the Chicago campus at Harrison-Halsted (May 10, 1961), the Illinois State Housing Board approved the Chicago Land Clearance Commission designation of the area as "slum and blighted" (August 8, 1961) and the Federal HHFA approved the necessary urban renewal funds (March 27, 1962), major opposition to the site grew in the community which the Chicago campus was to destroy. An active campaign headed by Florence Scala, a housewife from "The Valley," was launched in the Spring of 1961, to fight City Hall and the University. Mrs. Scala's campaign received wide press coverage and was able to raise $35,000 to finance a two-year legal battle to save the Harrison-Halsted neighborhood. But in the end, the struggle was in vain. The State Supreme Court on February 26, 1963 affirmed the lower court's decision to allow the campus to be built at Harrison-Halsted. And in May 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to rule on the appeal from the Harrison-Halsted Group. Thus on June 14, 1963, the massive clearance of the Harrison-Halsted area was begun.

Analysis of the Decision Makers and Conclusion

From the very beginning of the Chicago site search, the University of Illinois had "hoped for a green, tree-lined, sprawling suburban campus."[45] The University administrators naturally had been well indoctrinated in the "agrarian" and "collegiate" traditions which prevented them from visualizing a true university any other way. The University had always resisted the two natural urban settings for a city campus: a skyscraper or a cleared slum site. The University never seriously consid-

ered using a skyscraper for a campus. This opposition to a skyscraper campus was seen in the Board of Trustees report to the General Assembly (1957):

> In the very beginning, the University committee carefully studied tall buildings as against buildings of four stories and basement. Its estimates showed a tremendous saving if the lower type structures are used — a saving both in building costs and in maintenance. Further, it is very difficult to organize educational programs in tall buildings and provide for laboratories, recreation, and the mass movement of students in short time periods.[46]

The U. of I. seemed to have overlooked the fact that five other institutions of higher education in Chicago (Northwestern University-Chicago branch, Mundelein College, DePaul, Loyola and Roosevelt Universities) used tall buildings for campuses without causing much inconvenience to the schools or the students. Although the trustees stressed the prohibitive costs of a downtown skyscraper in their decision to reject such a site, it is hard not to believe that their "collegiate" vision of a university campus prevented them from visualizing a viable skyscraper campus.

As it turned out, the slum site was the lesser of these two evils, since from a massively cleared slum area a large, sprawling, rural-like campus could be artificially built. But until the very end, the University resisted a slum site. The University officials were often distrustful of the motive of the city of Chicago for pushing slum sites (the rail terminal site and the Harrison-Halsted site). Their public remarks often reflected this distrust. Gordon N. Ray, provost of the University of Illinois, revealed this in a speech to a University citizen committee meeting (May 19, 1960) when he said that there would never be a permanent Chicago campus "as long as Chicago officials, civic leaders and newspapers continue to put slum clearance ahead of education."[47] Mrs. Watkins of the trustees expressed a similar sentiment: "The real estate people want to beautify the city with the University and at its expense."[48] But the University did finally settle on the Harrison-Halsted slum site because there would be a "clean sweep" of the area (paid for by the federal government) which would make a sprawling tree-lined campus a possibility.

One would assume that President David Dodd Henry, who had been previously employed by two urban universities, would have been a supporter of a truly urban university within the city of Chicago. (Before coming to Illinois in 1955, Henry had been a vice chancellor of New York University and before that President of Wayne State University in Detroit). But this would be a faulty assumption. Banfield suggested that it was his "previous experience in the administration of two downtown campuses" that soured Henry on inner city campuses. He "strongly believed that the atmosphere of a big city would not be conducive to the best undergraduate life. Henry consequently favored a suburban

site. . . .[49] Henry also believed that an urban campus can create major barriers to a quality college education. The *Chicago Tribune* reported that: "President Henry can cite instances in which crowded urban surroundings were not merely a handicap, but an absolute barrier to hiring promising young faculty members. They had never been commuters and had no inclination to try it, and that was that."[50] A *Sun Times* article revealed a conversation that Henry had with State Senator William O'Connor in which he said he was opposed to a slum site and supported a suburban site "partly because students would not be forced to pass through blighted areas" when traveling to a suburban campus.[51] Thus, Henry also reflected the basic anti-urban bias of the "collegiate" tradition.

The Board of Trustees (especially during its Republican majority days, pre-1959) also revealed an anti-urban bias in its public statements and actions. The trustees made every attempt to locate the Chicago campus in a non-urban environment with their efforts to place the campus in the suburban settings. When the trustees were essentially forced by Mayor Daley to pick a site within the city limits of Chicago, they tended once again to gravitate to pastoral scenic sites. Meigs Field, which was the "first love" of the University trustees in the city, was a potentially scenic island in Lake Michigan, isolated from the truly urban and soiled environment of the city.[52] Garfield Park, because of its natural setting, was seen as a compromise site between a suburban park site and a city slum. I believe that many of the trustees were caught up in "agrarian myth" and viewed the city as intrinsically evil environment from which the campus had to be isolated. The trustees were constantly concerned about creating for the students "an environment protected against encroachment from undesirable developments," which naturally included crime, racial problems, pollution and over-crowded conditions.[53] The Board even believed that creating a suburban campus would be a favor for students living in the inner city: "City youngsters have just as much right — and perhaps a case could be made to show they have more right — to a college campus in a suitable setting away from the smoke and confusion of the city."[54] This anti-urban attitude dominated the Board of Trustees until 1960 when limited alternatives and a change in its composition allowed for a choice of an urban slum site.

Although the administration and faculty at the Navy Pier campus had a conception of a university more urban in its orientation than their colleagues at Champaign-Urbana, they still advocated non-urban settings for its location. As Dean Caveny stated: "The university here first and foremost favored a lake front island campus, and secondly a suburban location but never a slum site."[55] And in a study conducted by the Pier officials and released in July 1956, the Pier administration also recommended against a skyscraper campus for the Chicago branch, presenting arguments similar to those of the trustees.[56] The Pier students, likewise,

often advocated non-urban sites for the campus. They demonstrated in support of the Miller Meadows site on January 17, 1957.[57] The *Pier Illini*, the student paper at Navy Pier, criticized the University trustees for giving up on the fight over Miller Meadows in February 1957: "The University used extremely poor judgment in deciding for a non-publicity fight" over the Meadows site.[58] Of course, this enthusiastic support of such non-urban sites by the Pier students and some of the faculty may have been more related to the urgent need to just find a permanent campus than the influence of the "agrarian" and "collegiate" traditions. It was just more expedient to support the trustees' designated site than to fight it and propose another urban site which would have greatly slowed down the selection process. But the traditions of higher education probably did enter into the decision-making process of the Pier administrators and faculty when they advocated Miller Meadows and Meigs Field.

The Chicago daily newspapers, especially the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Sun-Times*, became major countervailing forces against the desire of the University to locate the Chicago campus in the suburbs or a rural-like setting within the city. The Chicago press generally opposed Miller Meadows, the Riverside Golf Course, Meigs Field and Garfield Park as campus sites. Dean Caveny testified to this opposition: "The press would not dignify a lakefront campus by discussing it, and the newspapers from the beginning opposed use of a recreational or greenery site which the University wanted and insisted on using the campus to rebuild an old area of the city. The press did not support the type of campus we wanted. . . ."[59] The newspapers' arguments against the suburban sites usually dealt with the high cost of the transportation for poor students who live in the inner city. And since the newspapers were major advocates of the public park system in Chicago, they naturally opposed park sites in the city.

But it was Richard J. Daley and his powerful Democratic political organization that became the real countervailing force which prevented the University of Illinois from carrying-out its anti-urban biases in the campus selection. Of course, Daley's major motives for opposing the University's site proposals and promoting inner city sites were political. It would be naive to suggest that Mayor Daley of Chicago, who was "one of the most capable municipal administrators in the country" and headed "the most efficient and disciplined political organization in the country," would not be influenced by political factors when dealing with such a major controversial issue as finding a permanent campus for the U. of I. in Chicago.[60] The political prestige of saving the campus from "suburbia" could not help but put more votes in Daley's column during city elections. And the further enhancement of Daley's image as a rebuilder and revitalizer of Chicago downtown area would also be reinforced by a campus site which involved a major urban renewal project.

Although political motives dominated Daley's deliberations about the

Chicago campus, one cannot eliminate all other factors which might have influenced Daley's decisions about the campus site. Daley, who attended DePaul University (a Catholic urban university) probably saw many advantages of a truly urban university. Since Daley could not afford college full-time, he attended night school, usually four nights a week for eleven years (1923-1934) to receive a B.A. degree and a law degree.[61] Up until recently, it was an unique characteristic of urban universities to offer a large selection of night classes which allowed part-time students to attend college. Daley was not only a product of an urban university but he sent his children to the two Catholic urban universities in Chicago. His image of an "ideal" university probably had an urban orientation and was somewhat free of the "agrarian" and "collegiate" traditions.

Although Daley could be a hard-hearted and ruthless politician under many circumstances, he had a soft spot in his heart for the "common man" in the city. Daley, a man of poor, Irish heritage, identified closely with the ethnic working classes of the city of Chicago. He was a firm believer in that every man should have the opportunity to pull himself up by his "boot straps" — to better himself. And Daley realized that education was one way of bettering oneself and rising above the social and financial status of the previous generation. Arthur Rothstein in his study of the site selection process saw this personal characteristic of Daley which may have influenced his decision on the campus site: "Mayor Daley was sincere in his quest for railroad consolidation, and, according to knowledgeable observers, in his desire for a downtown campus for a first class, yet inexpensive commuter University for the Chicago working man's children."[62] Daley's vision of an urban public university and its relationship to the community in which it is located, may have been more progressive than those visions of the University of Illinois officials.

One cannot deny that many practical factors entered into the whole complex campus site selection process. Such practical factors included the availability of funds to buy the site, the urgency to find a site by 1963, the ceaseless struggle between downstate Republicans and Chicago Democrats, and the clash of other powerful interest groups in the pursuit of their own specific goals. But the major decision-makers, especially those closely connected with the University of Illinois, must have had "ideal" images of what the Chicago campus should look like and where it should be located. As I suggested previously, this image of the "ideal" public urban university was derived from the manner in which each decision-maker defined the mission of the Chicago branch and the extent to which they were influenced by the "agrarian" and "collegiate" traditions of higher education. The officials of the University of Illinois, who adhered closely to the "agrarian" and "collegiate" traditions often had the image of an "ideal" campus as being pastoral in nature and isolated from the undesirable urban environment in which it was to be

located. This contradictory vision of an urban university plagued the whole site selection process and probably prolonged the search by several years. The Chicago campus controversy was representative of the uncertain place of public urban universities in the American higher education system during the 1950's. The educators of higher education began to realize the urgent need to locate public colleges and universities in large metropolitan areas because the United States had become an overwhelmingly urbanized nation by the 1950's and there were many more potential students in these urban centers. However, the educators' concepts of higher education, which were still anchored firmly in 19th century foundations of the "collegiate tradition," prevented them from fully comprehending the rich potentialities of a public urban university in 20th century America.

Notes

[1] "Report to the 69th Session of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois by the Commission in Relation to the Establishment of a Branch of the University of Illinois in the Chicago Area, 24 February 1955, "Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection, University of Illinois — Circle Campus Library, Chicago, Illinois.

[2] Andrew Schiller, "Chicago's Oxford on the Rocks: New Break for City Youngsters," *Harper's Magazine*, (May 1965).

[3] Committee on Future Development of the Chicago Undergraduate Division, "Proposals for the Future Development of the Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois: A Report to President Lloyd Morey, June 1954," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection.

[4] "Petitions and Proposals of the Navy Pier Faculty to University of Illinois Board of Trustees, 23 April 1953," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection.

[5] Gene Burd, "The Role of the Chicago Daily Newspaper in the Selection of the Chicago Campus for the University of Illinois" (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1964), p. 18.

[6] "Site Selection for Relocation of the Chicago Undergraduate Division: Report of the Committee on General Policy, Board of Trustees, 19 February 1959," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection, pp. 3-4.

[7] Ibid., p. 4.

[8] Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), pp. 95-96.

[9] Ibid., p. 87.

[10] "Future Educational Program of the Chicago Undergraduate Division: Preliminary Draft for use by the provost and the author only, 1 October 1959,"

Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection, p. 6.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., p. 7.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Committee on Curricular Expansion, Senate of the Chicago Division of the University of Illinois, "A Concept for the University of Illinois in Chicago," 1 May 1959," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection, p. 51.

[15] "Report of the Interim Committee to Advise Concerning Physical Planning for the Chicago Undergraduate Division Campus, December 1960," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Burd, p. 370.

[18] Edward C. Banfield, *Political Influence: A New Theory of Urban Politics* (New York: Free Press, 1961), p. 160.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., pp. 160-161.

[22] Ibid., pp. 162-163, 184-189.

[23] Ibid., p. 166.

[24] Ibid., p. 171.

[25] Ibid., pp. 170-177.

[26] "U. of I. Drops Miller Meadow Site Proposal," *Chicago Sun-Times*, 31 January 1957.

[27] Arthur H. Rothstein, "The Circle Campus — The Site Was the Ball Game" (M.A. Thesis, University of Chicago, June 1971), p. 16.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Burd, p. 30.

[30] Ibid., p. 31.

[31] Department of City Planning, "Development Plan for the Central Area of Chicago, August 1958," pp. 7-8.

[32] Burd, p. 30.

[33] Real Estate Research Corporation, "Analysis of Sites for the Campus of Chicago Undergraduate Division University of Illinois, October 1958," p. 27.

[34] D.E. Mackelmen, interview by Arthur H. Rothstein, 3 May 1971.

[35] Burd, p. 35.

[36] "Students Trek to City Hall With a Gripe," *Chicago Tribune*, 7 April 1959.

[37] Burd, pp. 189-190.

[38] Ibid., p. 138.

[39] Ibid., p. 37.

[40] Mackelman, interview.

[41] Rothstein, p. 39.

[42] Burd, pp. 486-487.

[43] "Report of the Committee on General Policy of Conference with City of Chicago Officials on Chicago Undergraduate Division site, Board of Trustees Meeting, 19 October 1960," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection.

[44] "Chicago Undergraduate Division Site Selection Report of Committee on General Policy, 15 February 1961," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection.

[45] Rothstein, p. 13.

[46] "Statement Submitted by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois Regarding a Site for the Chicago Undergraduate Division Prepared for The Appropriations Committee, 70th General Assembly of Illinois, 30 April 1957," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection.

[47] Burd, p. 340.

[48] Frances Watkins, interview by Gene Burd, 17 May 1960.

[49] Banfield, p. 181.

[50] "Faculty Housing A Major Factor in Picking U. of I. Branch Site," *Chicago Sunday Tribune*, 15 February 1959.

[51] *Chicago Sun-Times*, 31 January 1957, p. 25.

[52] Burd, p. 109.

[53] "Report of Committee on General Policy on Site for the Chicago Undergraduate Division to Board of Trustees, 11 March 1958," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection.

[54] "A Permanent Site for Chicago Undergraduate Division: The University of Illinois' Position Regarding the Relocation of the Chicago Undergraduate Division, 13 February 1957," Chicago Branch Site Selection Collection.

[55] Charles C. Caveny, interview by Gene Burd, 21 September 1961.

[56] "Find Suburban U. of I. Site Convenient," *Chicago Sun-Times*, 19 July 1956.

[57] Burd, p. 54.

[58] "Action Needed Now to Obtain New Site," *Pier Illini*, 11 February 1957.

[59] Caveny, interview.

[60] Milton Rakove, *Don't Make No Waves, Don't Back No Losers: An Insider's Analysis of the Daley Machine* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1975), p. 43.

[61] Len O'Connor, *Clout: Mayor Daley and His City* (New York: Avon Books, 1975), p. 24.

[62] Rothstein, p. 26.

Between Two Worlds: The Residential College at the University of Michigan

Marlene C. Hathaway
The University of Michigan

The history of the Residential College is a story of tension and change between two worlds: that of the small, experimental liberal arts college, and that of the large research university. The RC belongs to both. It is a living-learning community of teachers and students who care about ideas and each other and the College they share.

The Residential College has experienced four major periods in its history, each marked by tension and change. *Beginnings/Visions 1963-67* was a time of planning, of gathering ideas, developing a detailed plan for the College, and generating support within the University and especially the College of Literature, Science and Arts (LSA). *Realities/Changes 1967-72* saw the actual beginnings of the RC and a turbulent time of change and development when the visions of the planners were modified by the realities of student and faculty and university needs and problems. *Review/Consolidation 1972-77* began with an external review which pointed out problems but affirmed the continuation of the RC; the period following involved changes that adapted to problems and consolidated strengths. *Self-Study/Maintenance 1977* . . . has been a time of self scrutiny and work to maintain the goals and purposes of the College.

In all of these periods, major problems and changes involved financing, staffing, student interests, curriculum, and governance, including the key relationship between RC and LSA. Almost all of the visions of the planners have been modified except the key goal of a living-learning community that makes the RC a unique place between two worlds.

In response to a number of pressures and needs early in the 1960's, several key people at the University of Michigan committed themselves to the idea of a small experimental liberal arts college within the University. This was to be a college within a college, a source of innovation, a living-learning community of teachers and students. The planners hoped it would capture "the best of two worlds," the personal concern of a small college within the diversity and freedom of a great university.[1]

What developed out of these ideas became the Residential College, a unit of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (LSA). It welcomed its first class of 217 freshmen in the fall of 1967, and in the fall of 1979 it is still active and serving about 700 students. But the RC of 1979 is

very different from the college planned in the early 60's and different from the college that began in 1967. The history of the college is a story of change, of adapting to circumstances, students, finances, of living within and between two worlds, the world of small experimental liberal arts colleges and the world of large research universities. The Residential College survives in a precarious but creative tension between these two worlds.

Beginnings/Visions 1963-67

Several forces and people combined to develop the idea of an experimental college at Michigan. The LSA College was pressed by growth as great numbers of students came to the University in the early 60's. Space, faculty, courses were extended beyond capacity and the LSA faculty felt caught between its commitment to provide a good education for Michigan youth and its limitations of energy and expansion. Many saw the Residential College as a way to accommodate growth without losing quality; there were even notions of developing a whole series of such colleges. Educational innovation was another goal that attracted LSA faculty. This was the primary purpose for many of the strongest supporters of the plan: Dean and later Vice President Roger Heyns; Professor Theodore Newcomb, whose research on students and experimental colleges provided much of the plan's theoretical framework; Professor Wilbert J. McKeachie, who chaired the Curriculum Committee that first circulated the proposal; Professor Hay, who chaired a second special study committee; and Dean Burton Thuma, who chaired the Planning Committee and became the first director. These men saw the Residential College as an opportunity to try new educational ideas in a special setting, with the hope that these would carry over and enrich the parent LSA College.

Like most professors, the LSA faculty raised a lot of questions and debated the question thoroughly before approving the RC. A reading of LSA faculty minutes reveals that the original proposal was circulated to the LSA faculty in the spring of 1963 and debated thoroughly during the 1963-64 college year. In December 1963, the faculty voted favorably on the basic idea but created a special study committee to examine problems. There was a second vote in March 1964, after the committee reported and then a third vote in September establishing the administrative relationships between LSA and the RC. Issues in these various debates included questions about the purpose of the RC, the need for innovation, the effects on growth, the problems of funding and staffing the new college; many of these questions have continued to surface over the years. Nevertheless, in September 1964, the LSA faculty approved the proposed college and appointed a special Planning Committee.

Dean Burton Thuma chaired the Planning Committee and also was named director of the Residential College. Professor Newcomb was

appointed associate director and played an important role in shaping the new college. The Committee spent over a year in extensive and detailed planning which included curriculum, faculty, student body, living-learning facilities, and a carefully thought-out rationale. An initial report was presented to the faculty in the fall of 1965 with a more complete report and discussion in the spring of 1966. On April 18, 1966, Dean William Haber reported to the faculty that the Regents had approved the Residential College with these conditions: that there be no tuition increase, no increase in residence hall fees, and no student funds used to finance classroom facilities. Thus the Planning Committee was authorized to develop its vision in detail.

The vision was complex and exciting and fully described in an extensive report dated July 1966. This report outlined the desired goals and purposes, the curriculum, staffing, student population, governance and funding plans and needs for the new college. It envisioned the Residential College as a community: in residence, in study, at play, in the Arts; it was to be a community of students and teachers living, learning, playing, and creating together. This community would counteract the bigness and impersonality of the parent LSA College and the University as a whole. It would also stimulate and provide a place for innovative educational experiments. From the beginning the RC was seen as an experiment subject to constant change and development.

A sizeable portion of the Report described the campus of the RC which was to be built on a 40-acre site between Fuller Road and the Huron River, near North Campus. This would provide the physical identity of the new college, "an architectual and aesthetic unit, . . . both the instrument and the concrete manifestation of the community."[2] It was to include its own library, three academic buildings, and several residence halls offering a variety of accommodations. There would also be a dining commons, athletic facilities, and plenty of lounges and meeting places where students and faculty could gather informally. The Committee clearly believed the campus to be an essential element in the design and success of the College.

Another key element in the new college was its curriculum. The planners sought freedom and flexibility within a carefully designed liberal arts curriculum. Course methods would vary from small classes and seminars to independent study and large lectures that would include the whole freshman and sophomore class. Some courses would be graded, some evaluated pass/fail with written statements about the student's efforts and achievements. Every student would take a basic Core Curriculum which would include:

Logic and Language (freshman, lecture, grades)

History — Humanities (one year)

Social Science (one year)

Natural Science (2 options, 4 terms)

Foreign Language (genuine fluency, demonstrated by a proficiency examination and a course in the literature of the language)

Arts Practicum (one term)

In addition to the Core, every student would select or develop a concentration either in LSA or in the RC or in an interdisciplinary combination. Sophomores would take a comprehensive examination over the Core Curriculum and seniors would take a general examination over their area of concentration. Thus the planners attempted to balance individual choice with what they considered a rational, rigorous, liberal arts curriculum.

The people who would make up the Residential College were also an essential part of the plan. The planners foresaw recruitment of faculty as a complex but possible task. They envisioned a faculty of about 80, many of whom would be part-time. All would have full University status, but there would be many kinds of appointments: some half RC, half LSA, some LSA on loan to the RC, some more permanent at RC but still part of LSA. The planners envisioned many benefits for faculty and both colleges: they could recruit good faculty interested in undergraduates and still attracted to the opportunities of a large university; experimentation in the RC would be carried back to LSA by returning faculty; a constant moving back and forth would stimulate faculty in both colleges and would benefit students.

Careful attention was also given to the nature of the student body. The RC could have become a sort of honors college, but the planners consciously chose to make it instead a microcosm of enrollment in LSA. They planned for an eventual enrollment of 1,200 students. The entering class of 217 freshmen was selected from 1,400 interested students to reflect as closely as possible the demographic make-up of the parent college. Professor Newcomb supervised this process with the express purpose of assuring that the RC would be a valid experiment with an unbiased student body.[3] The one unknown factor was the self-selection process of both students and faculty. Only those interested in and committed to experimental liberal arts education would choose to be involved, and their adventurous spirits strongly influenced the later development of the College.

Questions of governance, finances, and relationships were also dealt with in the Planning Report. From the beginning money was a problem, both for the campus and for operating expenses. The planners foresaw a need for federal, state, and private donors to make the dream come true,

and they reported that "very little of these monies have been gathered so far. . . ." The question of governance and relationships was also addressed. The administrative structure was to "provide relative autonomy for the RC in the development of curricular and extracurricular programs;"[4] the RC was to be supervised by a director and associate director, and it would have a government in which both RC faculty and students would participate. At the same time the RC would be part of LSA and responsible to its dean and Executive Committee. The details and complexities of this system have changed over the years and have never been completely comfortable. This is one of the several tensions in the story of the College.

Realities/Changes 1967-72

Rather than wait for construction of its planned campus, the RC began operations in East Quad, a renovated dormitory, in the fall of 1967. Dean James Robertson served as director of the RC from its opening until 1973, bringing the College through six years of growth and tremendous change. The College underwent several crises and reviews and studies, many of them part of its role as an experimental unit. Every part of the original vision was examined, tried, and usually altered in response to experience and situations. Some sense of those first years comes through in Dean Robertson's report to the LSA faculty during its first year:

> Life in the Residential College had been a series of surprises, . . . a challenging test of the flexibility, resourcefulness and resilience of the human spirit." But despite problems, students, faculty, and administration had created "an intellectual community justifying the essential validity of the Residential College idea.[5]

One of the first visions to be questioned was a home for the College. Within a few months of settling into the temporary quarters in East Quad, students, faculty and administrators began to feel that this was a better location than the more isolated Fuller Road area. Students had easy access to all the facilities of the main campus, and faculty with joint appointments could move back and forth comfortably. With proper renovation, East Quad might be a better home for the RC than its own elaborately planned campus. In March 1968, the RC community, students and staff, met with the Regents, President Robben Flemming, and administrative officers of LSA and the University to discuss the question. As a result the Regents approved the use and renovation of East Quad and eventually appropriated $3 million for the work.[6] Although loss of the specially designed living-learning campus distressed some and no doubt changed the nature of the RC design, most involved agree it was a wise choice. Professor Newcomb calls it "the most important and best decision we ever made."[7]

Questions of governance also occupied much time during the first few months of the College. The planners envisioned an internal governance system that would include both students and faculty. A long series of meetings produced a constitution for a Representative Assembly to include the director and 16 delegates: 8 students, 6 faculty/administrators, 2 resident fellows. This group clearly gave students real power and it was mandated to deal with policies and guidelines for the entire College. The director was given veto power but no director has ever used it.[8] The other side of governance was the College's relationship with LSA. Since he retained his title as associate dean of LSA, Dean Robertson attended executive and staff meetings in LSA and served as the essential link between the two units.[9]

A third element of the original plan to be questioned was the curriculum. Students soon rebelled against the Core Curriculum, partly because it was required, partly because some of the courses were seen as ineffective, partly because of its lack of flexibility. In April 1969, the Representative Assembly created a student-faculty Core Curriculum Review Committee which effected some reductions in the requirements. Essentially they kept the core but made it recommended, not required. They retained the freshman seminar, foreign language proficiency and arts practicum as requirements, and required all students to take a minimum of 12 courses in the RC.[10]

The sophomore comprehensive exam was dropped before it was even tried, partly because students objected to it as a "policing" activity and partly because it had been designed to test a core curriculum that never really quite worked. A more drastic curriculum change, known as "Proposal C," went to LSA for action because it meant changing degree requirements by dropping all requirements. This proposal was never acted on. Two sets of interviews in 1970, one with RC students by Bill Moore and one with RC faculty by J.B. Francis, revealed strong support of the RC concept in both groups and general satisfaction with the teaching and learning experience there. Once the core curriculum was made more flexible, both groups seemed to be satisfied.

But neither faculty nor student life was smooth and easy in these early years. Of course these were difficult years on campuses all over the nation; Michigan and the RC were part of a larger phenomenon. When the planners set up the RC to reflect the composition of LSA, they did not account for likely personality differences between the two groups. These occurred from the beginning and became more pronounced with time. Newcomb studied the first few classes and found that while RC students matched LSA students intellectually, they were far more likely to be interested in ideas, in openness, in a nonconformist style of education.[12] Moore's interviews in 1970 revealed a liberal and intellectual stereotype of RC students, very tolerant of a wide variety of behavior.[13] An intensive self study of the RC by Ellis Wunsch in 1971 called the students "ven-

turesome, intellectually inclined, non-conforming, and aesthetically motivated."[14] This lively group of students made a real difference in the classrooms and corridors and atmosphere of the RC. They were often involved in public and social issues and gave the College a reputation in some circles as being full of radicals and hippies. While there were no doubt some excesses, in retrospect the RC does not seem to have caused a great deal of trouble. The image was probably more damaging than the reality.

The problems of staffing the RC turned out to be more troublesome than the planners had foreseen. In August 1967, Dean Haber reported that recruitment of faculty "has progressed well, and . . . many of our outstanding teachers and distinguished scholars have volunteered to teach for the new College."[15] But in December 1968, Dean Robertson reported a 50-50 ratio between faculty and teaching fellows in the RC.[16] A statement of policy in 1971 revealed that of 80 persons teaching one or more classes, over 50 were either teaching fellows or lecturers.[17] Clearly the vision of senior professors staffing RC classes was greatly diminished. There were many reasons for this: budget constraints, departmental values and reward systems and reluctance, the nature of the courses and perhaps of the students (some faculty were unable to adapt to the questioning and even irreverent attitudes of RC students). The staffing problems led to serious problems with continuity of programs and curriculum. The Francis interviews in 1970 revealed many of these problems and yet showed that an "overwhelming majority" of RC faculty found their experience "interesting, absorbing, and fulfilling." They devoted more than the required time to their courses, counseling, and seeing students.[18] In spite of problems and heavy turnover, the RC was blessed even in these turbulent years with a devoted, hard-working, deeply committed faculty.

The staffing problem was of course closely related to the RC's financial situation. The new college was never adequately financed. The planners had hoped for a successful fund drive and outside support, but these never developed. The Regents appropriated extra funds to renovate East Quad, but provided little help in the way of operating funds. The LSA was also pressed by large enrollments and staffing problems, all the usual needs. In his first report to the LSA faculty, Dean Robertson acknowledged that "the Literary College and its departments had provided self-sacrificing assistance in matters involving faculty and funding."[19] In April 1970, Robertson reported a difference of $100,000 between costs and budget of the RC for the coming year.[20] The College survived these early years through the sometimes grudging assistance of the LSA and the dedication of a generous and sometimes exploited faculty.

These early years turned the Residential College from an idealized

vision of "the best of two worlds" into a realized but turbulent community of teachers and students who cared about issues and ideas and about the College and each other. They were difficult years, but those who lived through them found them, on balance, rewarding and worth the struggle. But struggle there was, struggle and tension and constant change. An amusing and probably overstated description of those struggles appeared in a Report of the LSA Executive Committee in 1969. It gives some sense of the problems the RC faced in those years:

> A perennial item of the Committee's agenda is the Residential College. This child of the LS & A appears to live from crisis to crisis. It is living on a pieced-together budget in a building that is being renovated at the same time as it is being used as a dormitory and for classroom teaching. The Committee looks forward each week to Dean Robertson's report of the latest perils through which his College has passed. In view of the Residential College's extraordinary financial status, composed in uncertain parts of general funds, borrowing, and charity, it does not seem likely that the end of its tribulations is imminent.[21]

Review/Consolidation 1972-77

In the fall, 1971, LSA Dean Frank Rhodes appointed a special committee to review the RC and to consider its future, including the possibility of its termination. Professor Rhoads Murphey chaired this committee which presented a very thorough report in the spring of 1972. The committee included some severe critics of the RC and the College seemed in real jeopardy. This was probably the low point in the history of the RC. The Murphey Report was extensive and often very critical but it ended by affirming the goals and purpose and viability of the RC. In the process of careful study, some of the greatest critics became believers.

Some of the major findings and recommendations of the Murphey Report can be summarized briefly. The Committee found "warmth and unity" and "a positive sense of community" in the RC. It explored three major curricular issues: a possible need for some check on standards under pass/fail evaluation, a need for priorities in planning concentrations, and a need for balance in the curriculum (more science). Examining governance issues, the committee felt that the Representative Assembly had become ineffective because too few faculty attended and its meetings had become bogged down with trivia. The committee felt that "structural looseness" in its internal administration was a serious weakness of the RC and commended a new committee system as remedying this. The Murphey Report also reviewed staffing and financial problems and the relative cost of RC education, which it did not find excessive. The committee felt that there should be better communication between the RC and LSA, especially about educational innovations. It found the RC

experiments better known nationally than on the Michigan campus.

The Murphey Committee made a number of important recommendations. It affirmed the RC as a four-year residential college and as a unit of LSA, "responsible and responsive to it, depending on it, serving it, and pioneering for it." The Committee suggested that the College remain small, at about 750 students, and that the curriculum be balanced, focused on freshman/sophomore general education and on concentrations not otherwise available. The Committee urged a more stable faculty and much less dependence on teaching fellows. To stabilize the financial situation, the Committee recommended that every LSA Department be required to make a financial commitment to the RC which could be recovered only when some of its faculty became involved in RC programs and courses. This "tax" was probably the most interesting remedy ever suggested for the RC's perennial financial problems, but nothing ever came of the suggestion. Finally, to stabilize internal administration, the Committee recommended rearranging the work of three associate directors, one for curriculum, one for appointments, one for counseling and student relations; all would also teach half time in the College. In order to improve liaison and communication between LSA and the RC, the Murphey Committee recommended a Permanent Joint Board to consist of eight members, four from each college. This Board would serve as an operative link between the units, decide major questions of policy, approve appointments, and review the RC periodically.[22]

The LSA faculty held a long and spirited discussion of the Murphey Report and the future of the RC in October 1972. Interest focused on costs, on implications for departmental budgets, on some feeling that the RC had become an expensive "academic sandbox," and on a conflicting notion that LSA students were being cheated because RC students had special opportunities. The meeting was so heated and confusing that the Executive Committee felt impelled to interpret the results of the discussion and voting. That interpretation was accepted and included the following: The RC should be continued; its budget should be determined by the LSA Executive Committee and Dean; departmental involvement should be voluntary (no tax); a Joint Board should be established; the RC should be reviewed every four years.[23] Thus the Residential College survived a crucial test with its purposes and goals affirmed, its problems examined and recognized, but the crucial matters of financing and staffing unsolved.

The Joint Board recommended in the Murphey Report was appointed by Dean Rhodes in December 1972. Professor Harold Shapiro was the first chairman and played a crucial role in the early activities of the Board. These activities included liaison, clarification of issues, and resolution of some personnel and budget problems. Its initial efforts, in the winter and spring of 1973, were devoted to personnel issues, including some delicate

negotiations with LSA departments on behalf of current RC staff and the seeking of additional faculty. Largely through the Board's intervention and persuasion, two or three key RC faculty received more permanent appointments and recognition.[24]

The Joint Board was especially important and effective during the 1973-74 year when Acting Director Louis Orlin was handicapped by poor health. Shapiro continued to chair the Board, which in the fall of 1973 became closely involved in the administration of the RC. Professor Jens Zorn, a member of the Board and the RC Executive Committee and a teacher in the College, served as chief among several who helped fill the administrative breach. Again the Board devoted much time to staffing problems, especially to considering a policy of term contracts for lecturers. Although Orlin returned to duty in the winter term, he was never able to really function as director. He proposed some curricular modifications which the Board considered but which found little support in the College. Because the College was searching for a permanent director, a generally felt concern for curriculum was held in abeyance. The Joint Board kept the RC together and moving during this interim year.[25]

In fall 1974, Marc Ross, professor of physics, was appointed to a three-year term as director of the Residential College. He served half-time there and continued to teach, both in the RC and in LSA. His chief goals as director included stabilizing the administrative situation, strengthening the faculty and curriculum and developing a more respectable image for the College.[26] The latter task was complicated by the GEO strike in February 1975. The RC voted to close down and offered office space and pickets to assist striking graduate teaching assistants. This action alienated many LSA faculty and created a constitutional crisis in which the RC was forced to amend its constitution to eliminate its provision for closing down the College. In a letter to LSA Dean Bill E. Frye, Joint Board Chairman Peter Smith pointed out that in spite of the closing, many RC classes were held in alternate forms and places and "attendance at classes approximated 50%," the same attendance estimated for LSA classes during that week. The RC's total action was not nearly as radical as some of its student leaders and its publicity.[27]

Circumstances and students were changing. Some old patterns no longer worked, and the Murphey Report provided a mandate for changes. Director Marc Ross gave primary attention to curricular and staffing problems, assisted by Professor Zelda Gamson who served as associate director for curriculum during 1974-76. The curriculum was reviewed and consolidated into viable programs and a coherent pattern. Action and power moved to the program level during these years, with close attention paid to building programs and concentrations of courses and other living-learning opportunities (field studies, language tables-parties-halls, etc.). This was accomplished through thorough program reviews that involved both students and faculty in the Curriculum Committee and in program

planning and review committees. Ross came to the RC believing that participation of senior faculty was essential to strengthen the academic status of the College. But he found that the financial situation discouraged this solution and that curricular changes and some review and stabilization of the existing faculty produced most of the desired results.[28]

Ross moved to stabilize the administration of the College through an expanded committee system. These committees included students and many were related to curricular reform and program review. The Representative Assembly, still student-dominated, functioned more and more as a dorm government instead of a college assembly. The Joint Board continued but met less frequently than at first and played a less active role. These changes occurred gradually, reflecting differences in the values and needs of students, faculty, administration and the College itself. Many strengths from the past were consolidated and some more edges of the original vision were modified. But the College retained its essential nature as a community, living and learning and changing together.[29]

Self-Study/Maintenance 1977 . . .

In 1976 the RC underwent a second major review by a committee of LSA faculty chaired by Professor John Mersereau, Jr. As in previous reviews, this committee's mandate included the possibility of terminating the RC, and some members came prepared to do so. Instead, after careful scrutiny, they concluded that the RC was financially, academically and philosophically viable.[30] They reviewed the problems that continued to plague the College and they made some careful comparisons with LSA students and programs and costs. They also studied the impact of the Murphey Report and reviewed progress on those recommendations. They found that the Joint Board had been effective and that, while staffing problems had not been fully solved, the faculty had become more stable and dependence on teaching fellows had been greatly reduced. Curriculum was considered satisfactory and the achievements of RC students and graduates commended. They concluded that "current RC degree requirements are more demanding, more coherent and more firmly based on clearly stated educational principles than are LSA's."[31]

The judgment of this review committee was confirmed by the appointment of Professor Mersereau to a five-year term as full-time director of the Residential College. He brought to the task the stature of a well-known full professor in LSA, some administrative experience, and the knowledge gained from his service chairing the RC review committee. Mersereau began his service in the fall of 1977 and has concentrated on maintaining the strengths and dealing with the perennial problems of the College. The latter include the difficulties of living and working in an old dormitory renovated in 1970 and showing the wear of

heavy use. There are also annual budget struggles, staffing problems and liaison with LSA to consider. Mersereau has the advantage of full-time responsibility and the support of LSA Dean Bill E. Frye who publicly declared at an LSA faculty meeting, "The Residential College has established its right to a place here."[32] Many of the problems experienced in the early years remain, less severe and in a somewhat different form, but still part of life and change in the RC.

In dealing with these problems, Mersereau has concentrated on governance, curriculum, and the people of the RC. The College continues to maintain relationships with LSA through the Joint Board now consisting of 3 LSA faculty, 3 RC members (1 student) and the RC director as chairman. Mersereau uses the Board as an advisory body to oversee curriculum through reviews of programs every three years, to review and recommend appointments, promotions, and recruitment of staff and students, and to serve as a lobby with the LSA Executive Committee.[33] Internal governance is organized largely through committees that include both students and faculty. The Representative Assembly is now essentially a dorm government. To create a closer relationship between dorm management and RC administration, the East Quad housing director has been made an associate director of the RC; in fall 1979 he also taught a freshman seminar. Also in fall 1979 the faculty asked to have monthly meetings in order to know each other better and to coordinate their work. Thus internal governance has settled into a pattern of faculty meetings, student meetings, and joint meetings on the working committees of the College, an interesting change and compromise of the original vision of joint responsibility.

The curriculum of the RC is under constant review at both the program and college levels. Of the original Core Curriculum, three requirements remain: the freshman seminar, the strong language proficiency and the arts practicum. The language requirement has been under constant review and attack and has survived every year. Some students and faculty see it as the most distinctive element and most positive standard in the College.[34] The RC now offers a limited number of attractive interdisciplinary programs and concentrations, all of which require students to take courses outside as well as in the RC. Students may also choose LSA concentrations. Courses and faculty in each program or concentration are reviewed every three years for individual effectiveness and for relationship to the program and the RC curriculum as a whole. Thus every element in the curriculum justifies its purpose and its usefulness, keeping the College open to relevance and change. Although it lacks most of the details envisioned by the planners, the curriculum maintains in this way the original commitment to flexibility within a strong liberal arts tradition. Unencumbered by a departmental organization, it remains open to additional change and experimentation, such as student research projects, field studies and creative work. The current curriculum thus maintains a

balance between innovation and stability.

The essence of the Residential College remains its commitment to a community of students and faculty living and learning together. For this reason, with few exceptions, students are required to live in East Quad for two years. Juniors and seniors often prefer apartments but choose them nearby. Classes, offices, studios, dining facilities, lounges and dorm rooms all occupy the same building so that community life is often intense. Some students find this oppressive and transfer out, but those who remain are deeply loyal to the whole Residential College experience. Faculty also remain loyal, often spending extra hours tutoring, counseling or just chatting with their students. All through its history of change and problems, of creative tension between its own world and that of the University and College to which it belongs, the Residential College has remained true to this essential element of the planners' vision: the living-learning community of teachers and students who care about their work, their colleagues and their College.

Residential College — Chronology

May '63	Proposal circulated to LSA faculty, discussed in detail that fall
Dec. '63	LSA voted *feasibility*
March '64	LSA voted enabling legislation after report of Hay Committee
Sept. '64	Articles establishing administrative relations of RC and LSA; Planning Committee, Dean Thuma, chairman/director
Oct. '65	Thuma presented progress report
April '66	Dean William Haber reports Regents approval — three conditions — authorized opening in East Quad in fall, '66
June 23, '66	Regents formal approval
1966	Planning Committee active — site, buildings, curriculum
Fall '67	RC opened in East Quad. 217 students, Dean James Robertson, director; governance questions — Representative Assembly and committees
March '68	RC met with Regents, asked to keep East Quad
April '69	Core Curriculum Review Committee created
Feb. '70	Core Curriculum Committee reported — reduced requirements

March '70	BAM strike; RC closed March 24; strike ended April 1. Black Action Movement
Nov. '70	"Proposal C" (curriculum)
Winter '71	Educational Policies Committee formed (report spring '72)
Fall '71	Murphey Review Committee, self-study by Ellis Wunsch
Dec. '72	Joint Board appointed by Dean Rhodes, Shapiro chairman
Fall '73	Louis Orlin, acting director
Fall '74	Marc Ross, director; Zelda Gamson and Ann Larimore, associate directors
Feb. '75	GEO strike; RC closed week of Feb. 11; students helped picket, provided office space
Fall '76	Self-study under Ross
1977	Mersereau Review Committee Report
Fall '77	John Mersereau, Jr., director

Notes

[1] *The Residential College*, Report of the Planning Committee, Burton D. Thuma, Chairman. July 1966. [Hereafter referred to as Planning Report.]

[2] Ibid., p. 28.

[3] Interview with Professor Theodore Newcomb, November 19, 1979.

[4] Planning Report.

[5] LSA Faculty Minutes, December 2, 1968.

[6] James H. Robertson, *Residential College: Synoptic History, 1967-1975* (unpublished manuscript, 1979).

[7] Newcomb interview.

[8] Constitution for the Representative Assembly, 1968. In an interview on November 19, 1979, Razelle Brooks, Assistant to the Director since the beginning of the College, indicated that no director has used the veto.

[9] Interview with Dean James Robertson, November 28, 1979.

[10] Report of the Core Curriculum Review Committee, February 24, 1970.

[11] Robertson interview.

[12] Theodore M. Newcomb, et al., "The University of Michigan's Residential College" in *The New Colleges: Toward An Appraisal*, ed. by Paul L. Dressel (Iowa City: ACT, 1971).

[13] Bill Moore, "Student Comments on the Core Curriculum and the Residential College 1969-70."

[14] Report from the Residential College to the Review Committee, compiled and edited by Ellis Wunsch, November 1971.

[15] Dean William Haber, Annual Report, August 1, 1967.

[16] LSA Faculty Minutes, December 2, 1968.

[17] A Statement of Policy Regarding Faculty in the Residential College, from the Director and Executive Committee, March 1971.

[18] John Bruce Francis, "Reactions of Residential College Faculty to the College, the Students, and the Core Curriculum," 1970.

[19] LSA Faculty Minutes, December 2, 1968.

[20] LSA Faculty Minutes, April 7, 1970.

[21] Professor Angus Campbell, Report of the Executive Committee, LSA, November 19-December 10, 1969.

[22] Residential College Review Committee Report, 1972. [Hereafter known as the Murphey Report.]

[23] LSA Faculty Minutes, October 2 and November 4, 1972.

[24] College of LSA, RC Program Evaluation Committee Report, Fall 1976; Minutes of the RC/LSA Joint Board, 1973. Shapiro's importance was mentioned by Robertson, Brooks, and Gamson in interviews.

[25] Interview with Prof. Jens Zorn, June 2, 1980; Joint Board Minutes, 1974.

[26] Interview with Prof. Marc Ross, November 27, 1979.

[27] Joint Board Minutes, 1975; Letter from Prof. Peter Smith to Dean Bill E. Frye, June 12, 1975.

[28] Ross interview; interview with Prof. Zelda Gamson, November 26, 1979; Program Evaluation Committee Report, 1976.

[29] Ross interview; Joint Board Minutes, 1974-1976.

[30] Interview with RC Director John Mersereau, Jr., November 28, 1979.

[31] Program Evaluation Report, 1976.

[32] Dean Bill E. Frye, quoted in the *University Record*, October 10, 1977, p. 1.

[33] Mersereau interview.

[34] Gamson interview.

References

Interviews:

Mrs. Razelle Brooks, Assistant to the Director of the RC, November 19, 1979.
Professor Carl Cohen, June 3, 1980.
Professor Zelda Gamson, November 26, 1979.
Professor John Mersereau, Jr., November 28, 1979.
Professor Theodore M. Newcomb, November 19, 1979.
Dean James Robertson, November 28, 1979.
Professor Marc Ross, November 27, 1979.
Professor Jens Zorn, June 2, 1980.

Documents and Other Sources:

The Residential College, Report of the Planning Committee, Burton D. Thuma, Chairman, July 1966.

The Residential College Announcement, 1967-68, a supplement to the announcement of the LSA College.

Constitution for the Representative Assembly, 1968.

Report of the Core Curriculum Review Committee, February 24, 1970.

Student Comments on the Core Curriculum and the Residential College 1969-1970, compiled by Bill Moore, 1970.

Reactions of Residential College Faculty to the College, the Students, and the Core Curriculum, compiled by John Bruce Francis, 1970.

Proposal C, November 1970.

A Statement of Policy Regarding Faculty in the Residential College, from the Director and Executive Committee, March 1971.

Report from the Residential College to the Review Committee, compiled and edited by Ellis Wunsch, November 1971.

Residential College Review Committee Report, 1972, Rhoads Murphey, Chairman.

College of LSA, RC Program Evaluation Committee Report, Fall 1976.

"What Happens When It's Over? Residential College Graduates, 1971-74," compiled by Zelda Gamson, et al., Fall 1976.

James Robertson, "Residential College: Synoptic History, 1967-1975" (Fall 1979).

Minutes of the RC/LSA Joint Board 1973-1980.

LSA Faculty Minutes.

Representative Assembly Minutes.

Dressel, Paul L., Ed., *The New Colleges: Toward An Appraisal*. Iowa City: ACT, 1971.

Gaff, Jerry G. et al., *The Cluster College*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1970.

Maroon Farewell: The Abolition of Intercollegiate Football at the University of Chicago

Sheldon S. Cohen
Loyola University of Chicago

For when the one great Scorer,
Comes to write against your name,
He writes, not that you won or lost,
But how you played the game.

Grantland Rice

Front pages of Chicago's daily newspapers on December 22, 1939 were mainly concerned with information from Europe's distant warfronts. Political columns focused on President Franklin Roosevelt's third term aspirations, the contested passage of a Cook County annual budget totalling $22,108,818, and the announcement of still another local crime investigation. News of holiday weddings, parties, and charitable events crowded the society pages, while theater pages told of appearances by stars such as Clifton Webb, John Barrymore, and Edward Everett Horton. Yet, in the sports pages many Chicagoans found the most noteworthy item — the University of Chicago Trustees had announced their school's withdrawal from intercollegiate football.[1]

Fifteen years earlier an announcement of the abolition of football at the University of Chicago would have been inconceivable. Maroon football, with a distinguished gridiron past, was still at a peak of national prestige. By the end of the 1924 season, Chicago had already won seven championships in the Western Intercollegiate (Big Ten) Conference. Four Chicago teams had gone undefeated, including the 1905 squad that ended the University of Michigan's 56-game unbeaten streak before a sellout crowd at Hyde Park's Marshall Field. The Maroons' national prestige had also been enhanced by their precedent-setting post-season game trip to the West Coast (1894-1895); their inauguration of intersectional northern-southwestern college football games (Chicago vs. University of Texas, 1904); and in October 1921, their 9-0 victory over Princeton had finally proven the power of Midwestern football to Eastern skeptics.[2]

The prime motivation behind this emergence as a national college football powerhouse had been Amos Alonzo Stagg, Chicago's coach since 1892. His leadership, enthusiasm and innovations for the game prompted Walter Camp to call him "the dean of Western football." Stagg deserved the title as he popularized the sport with novel tactics such

as fake handoffs, crossbucks, reverses, numerals on jersies, unbalanced lines, quick kicks and the shift. Furthermore, he had produced a galaxy of notable players on the Midway, including Walter Eckersall, Clarence Hershberger, Hugo Bezdek, Jesse Harper, Chuck McGuire, Wally Steffen, Otto Strohmeier, John Thomas and Herbert "Fritz" Crisler.[3]

The gridiron exploits of Stagg and his players had captivated Chicagoans during the first quarter of the 20th century. William Morganstern, former public relations director at the University and George Halas, president of the Chicago Bears, still recall the excitement of those seasons. Schoolboys emulated their heroes on the Midway; city officials proudly extolled Maroon victories; and pre-game festivities continually enlivened the Hyde Park neighborhood. Notables from the social register, including the McCutcheons, Swifts, Wilsons, Fields and Dunbars, flocked to the games at Marshall Field (renamed Stagg Field in 1913), and tickets in this 32,000-seat stadium often sold at a premium.[4]

Newspapers reflected these moments of Maroon glory. When a powerful Princeton team played at Chicago on October 28, 1922, coverage highlighted sports pages of all the city's dailies. The day before the contest the *Chicago Daily News* front page headline read, TIGERS IN CHICAGO WILDS AFTER MAROONS, while news of Mussolini's march on Rome received only secondary notice. Princeton's President John Hibbens and about 8,000 Tiger alumni attended this climactic intersectional contest; ticket scalping was rampant; parking places reportedly sold at "fancy prices;" and extra details of South Side policemen were stationed at the Stadium gates two hours before gametime to keep order. The contest itself was one of the most thrilling in football history, but a 21-18 Princeton victory ended Chicago's unbeaten season. Two years later, on November 8, 1924, similar notoriety surrounded a Chicago-Illinois contest that saw the underdog Maroons led by Austin "Five Yards" McCarty tie the Illini 21-21 despite three touchdowns by Harold "Red" Grange. Game tickets sold for as high as $100, but Walter Camp indicated their worth when he wrote that it "was one of the most wonderful games I have ever seen on any field anywhere." (Simultaneously, the 38-3 triumph of Notre Dame's "Four Horsemen" over Wisconsin received limited Chicago sports coverage.)[5]

The Illinois tie earned Chicago its seventh conference championship, and the 1924 season set a record for gate receipts, but the remainder of the decade was marked by declining football fortunes for the Maroons. From 1925 through 1929, Stagg's teams had a disappointing record of 18 wins, 23 losses and one tie, as many of the best players in the region had been attracted to other colleges. Attendance and ticket income from home games declined and plans to enlarge Stagg Field to a 70,000 seat capacity were shelved. Simultaneously, Knute Rockne's illustrious "Fighting Irish" squads were playing most of their home games at Soldier Field and

their appearances before over 100,000 spectators indicated that many of Chicago's college football fans were shifting their allegiance.[6]

These trends largely prevailed during the Depression years. From 1930 through 1936, Maroon teams compiled a further disheartening registry of 20 wins, 32 losses, and six ties. This adverse record, along with a tight money economy, damaged home attendance, which in the best year (1934) averaged only 15,000 per game. Coach Stagg reluctantly departed the Midway after the 1932 season and was replaced by Clark Shaughnessy, but even this eager young coach failed to produce a winning season. Like Stagg, Coach Shaughnessy lacked the fine football players found in other Big Ten schools. Beside the absence of generous sports scholarships at Chicago, this lack of sufficient talent was attributed to the academic policies of the new University president, Robert Maynard Hutchins. Hutchins failed to recognize physical education as a major subject, as many football conscious universities did to attract athletes, and his "New Plan" for academic excellence limited the effectiveness of spring practice. One football historian, Robin Lester, has concluded that the effects of Hutchins' stress on academic excellence was that Chicago football remained on the level of "elite Eastern schools" (i.e. Harvard and Yale) and fell well below the level of more "democratized" schools, such as Ohio State and Notre Dame.[7]

Nevertheless, Chicago had one illustrious figure during these bleak years in Jay Berwanger, a triple-threat star from Dubuque, Iowa, whose brilliant play earned him the first Heisman Trophy. Judge Robert J. Dunne (ret.), who then coached Maroon linemen, and James S. Kearns, a former *Chicago Daily News* sportswriter, still rate Berwanger as one of the great all-time players. Berwanger's single-handed tackling and running led the Maroons to respectable 4-4 seasons in 1934 and 1935, and temporarily restored some of Chicago's past football glamor.[8]

But the heroics of Berwanger, who received a "doctorate in football arts" from President Hutchins, were unable to halt the further deterioration of football at the University of Chicago. The season following Berwanger's graduation in 1936 produced a losing 2-5-1 record including the last Maroon Big Ten victory by a 7-6 score over Wisconsin. The 1937 season was marked by six defeats and a 26-9 victory over Beloit College.[9] It was not surprising, therefore, that William McNeill, chairman of the University's *Daily Maroon*, endorsed a new campus platform including the abolition of all intercollegiate athletics, particularly football. Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens, then a Chicago undergraduate, recalls that one response to McNeill's drastic proposals was exemplified "by the decision of the more conservative BMOC's (Big Men on Campus) to throw him into Botany Pond." McNeill, now a distinguished historian at Chicago, does not recall any such threats, but does remember that his anti-football speech at the annual football banquet in December 1937 was met with little enthusiasm from football-minded undergradu-

ates and alumni.[10]

Emmett Dedmon, chairman of the *Daily Maroon* in the autumn of 1938, also advocated the abolition of football, even suggesting that the Chicago Bears be given the use of Stagg Field. Dedmon, who later became editor of the *Chicago Sun-Times*, still agrees with his editorial of November 22, 1938, which argued that a principal reason why the University should abolish intercollegiate football was that "the public had come to regard a losing football team as the sign of a decadent student body." Consequently, the editorial continued, "Chicago was having difficulty in keeping its reputation as an educational institution from being dimmed by the notoriety of its football teams."[11] Other *Daily Maroon* editorials condemned the fact that open subsidization was becoming the rule in large universities, and that other Big Ten schools were unwilling to "regard football as anything but business." These views apparently reflected the views of President Hutchins himself. In an article published in the *Saturday Evening Post* (December 1938), Hutchins attacked the predominance of professionalism and profit in college football. Faculty sentiment favoring abolition also grew by 1938, although the school's venerable "faculty cheerleader," James Weber Linn, staunchly defended the *status quo* unless the players decided otherwise. *Pulse*, a monthly student magazine, also followed Linn's more positive tone; its September 1938 issue carried an article by team captain Lewis Hamity which was hoped "would lead to a greater degree of enthusiasm for the game and an increased support for your Maroons."[12]

Alumni support for the Maroons, as well as their concern and remedies for the disheartening football seasons was evidenced in the *University of Chicago Magazine*. Many letters from graduates sought to lay the blame on President Hutchin's alleged overemphasis on academics, and one alumnus proferred this solution: "Fifty thousand dollars will buy an All-American team. . . . It will be the easiest and surest business transaction in the world."[13]

This proposed transaction was not effected, however, and that autumn Maroon fans and players endured an even more dismal season. The football team once again recorded only a solitary victory, a 34-14 triumph over DePauw University of Indiana, but the margin of their defeats increased over the previous year. Chicago was trounced by Michigan (45-7), Ohio State (42-7), and Illinois (34-0). Even Amos Alonzo Stagg displayed no sentimentality toward his former team, as the "grand Old Man" returned to Hyde Park on November 12, and coached his College of the Pacific team to a 32-0 triumph over the hapless Maroons.[14] Surprisingly, Coach Shaughnessy's squad maintained a spirited resiliency throughout all these reverses. Lew Hamity, Robert Greenebaum and Sollie Sherman, seniors on that team, recall with pride the dogged determination of their team-mates to continue playing the game. None-

theless, T. Nelson Metcalf, Chicago's athletic director, indicated on November 22, 1938 that the University would be "systematically lightening its schedule." Ten days later an apprehensive John Chapman, president of the Chicago Alumni Club, announced a move to coordinate alumni assistance in recruiting scholar-athletes. However, Jay Berwanger, then serving as a freshman coach, sounded a note of future optimism when he wrote in the *University of Chicago Magazine* for December 1938, "Everyone should be looking forward to next year when we can be fairly confident of better results."[15]

Despite Berwanger's optimism, Coach Clark Shaughnessy had ample grounds for pessimism as he began preparing for the 1939 season. Although George Halas considered Shaughnessy a brilliant strategist and players recall his intense devotion to football as evidenced by the sketches of innovative gridiron tactics that adorned his home, acquiring players remained Shaughnessy's foremost problem. As he had already admitted in the *Daily Maroon*, "the fellows out for football at the University are a fine clean-cut bunch of lads, but with a few exceptions they're just not athletes." The *Chicago Tribune* appeared to share Shaughnessy's gloomy assessments when it noted that the 33 players who reported for opening practice on September 11, "constituted not only the smallest squad in the Western Conference, but also a new low at Chicago." During the ensuing weeks the team's deficiencies became so aggravated by injuries and ineligibilities that inexperienced players had to be recruited from the basketball, tennis, and water polo teams, and they lacked adequate practice time and equipment. Nevertheless, Shaughnessy and his coaches persevered, and on September 30, a "doughty," though undermanned Maroon varsity opened their season against Beloit College at Stagg Field.[16]

For Chicago's coaches, players, and dwindling fans, the 1939 season became one of bitter frustration. The opening contest saw the Maroons upset by Beloit 6-0; and the second game against Wabash, another small college, produced an unimpressive 12-2 victory. However, hopes for a limited winning streak were ended the following week when an undistinguished Harvard team gained a total of 555 yards as it demolished Shaughnessy's squad 61-0 at Stagg Field. A week later the score was even worse for the home fans as "Fritz" Crisler's powerful Michigan team rolled over Chicago by an 85-0 score, even though the Wolverines first team, and its All-American halfback, Tom Harmon, played less than half the game. An even higher tally was averted by Crisler's extensive use of substitutes and the curtailment of the second half by six minutes. On November 4, the Maroons were mauled by a smaller 47-0 margin in a weather-dampened game at the University of Virginia. The following Saturday, before only 2,000 spectators at Stagg Field, Chicago held Ohio State's first string scoreless for twelve minutes before being crushed 61-0. (Donald Wilson, then a 170-pound tackle, still remembers that

day's pummeling he received from an opposing 250 pound Buckeye tackle.) November 18 brought needed cheer to the Maroons as captain John Davenport scored three touchdowns in a 25-0 triumph over Oberlin. The season finale against Illinois had been shifted from Champaign to Chicago, but the 46-0 Maroon loss made many fans wish the game had been cancelled. Even the game's last play seemed characteristic of Chicago's frustration as halfback Bob Wasem was thrown for a five-yard loss on a broken play.[17]

The team's bitter disappointment was reflected in the sentiments of the University's students and alumni. Alice Meyer, an editor of the *Daily Maroon* recalls that she and her friends "resented the situation that precluded our team from competing effectively."[18] Bill Grody, in another *Maroon* column declared that Chicago "receives more publicity with poor football teams than with a superior aggregation." Editorials in the campus newspaper also lamented the adverse effects that the gridiron routs were having on the University's reputation, while simultaneously expressing sympathy for the team's plight. However, the *Maroon* laid the solution at the alumni's door: "If the alumni are responsible for the University's continuing football, they should be responsible also for making such continuation endurable."[19] *Pulse* looked to both the alumni and the Chicago trustees for assistance with the football problem, and its editor, Emil Hirsch, even recalls suggestions from frustrated staff members, that the administration surreptitiously buy the services of the Chicago Bears.[20]

Many disheartened local alumni, while not wishing to enroll professional talent, proposed recruiting quality high school athletes. On November 1, 1939 the *Chicago Tribune* reported that 200 alumni met at the LaSalle Hotel and advocated "aiding needy students with football ability to attend the University of Chicago." For the moment, however, most graduates, especially the older ones, simply complained of their "heartache" at watching Maroon games, and worried about the detrimental effect that the many one-sided losses were having on the University's image.[21]

There were grounds, of course, for concern about the University's image — an image that was still assailed by charges of moral decadence and political radicalism. Sports pages of Chicago's dailies, once dominated by news of Stagg's teams, had shifted their focus onto schools such as Notre Dame, Northwestern and Michigan, and covered Maroon football games with considerable derision. Thus, Harry Beardsley of the *Chicago Daily News* complained that his sports editor's assignment to watch Chicago "two weeks in a row is an apparent violation of the National Labor Relations Act." After the Michigan debacle, Beardsley decided to use "adding machines instead of a typewriter at the University of Chicago games." The *Chicago Tribune* reporter, Charles Bartlett, wrote after the same game: "The first shift of scorekeepers, which broke

down after the strain of posting 55 points for the first half, was reported to be recovering in Billings Hospital last night." When Chicago defeated Oberlin, the *Tribune's* sports headline read MAROONS ROUT (THAT'S RIGHT) OBERLIN 25 TO 0. And when William Morganstern, the University's public relations director, attempted to give extra football passes to local sports editors, his inquiry to Leo Fisher of the *Chicago American* was answered bluntly: "Keep your passes; not even the copy boys want to use your tickets!"[22]

Ultimately, the remedy for the Chicago football situation, and the financial and public relations problems accompanying it, lay with President Robert Hutchins and the University trustees. When Hutchins visited the Maroon locker room after the Michigan defeat to console the players, he assured them that "something would be done." Yet all of the options that appeared open to Hutchins and the trustees also presented problems.[23]

The simplest course that the administration might have followed was to carry through with the 1940 schedule, relying primarily on a promising freshman squad. Yet Hutchins and the trustees were reluctant to depend on this possibility, and even freshman coach Berwanger, who had praised his players, admits that he could not have guaranteed their varsity performances or that all of them would retain their academic eligibility. Furthermore, conference officials had rejected another player reservoir when it denied Chicago's request to use graduate or transfer students. The University also could have withdrawn from the Big Ten and scheduled primarily smaller Midwestern schools such as Oberlin and Wabash. This alternative, however, would have encountered opposition from many faculty and alumni who would regard the move as a lessening of Chicago's first-rate academic status; even President Hutchins proclaimed that, "We do not like to be classed with Monmouth and Illinois Wesleyan." Jay Berwanger still feels that the University might have joined the Ivy League, but in December 1939, Hutchins apparently dismissed this possibility in a letter to the trustees: "We are too far away from the New England colleges to make them the backbone of our schedule."[24]

The ultimate alternative was abolition of the sport on an intercollegiate basis, an option generating vigorous opposition from avid football alumni. Their strong sentiments had been revealed in the November 1939 meeting at the LaSalle Hotel and the annual football banquet when the sporting Chicago Alumni Club brought in 125 high school senior football players. There, John Chapman pointedly told these athletes: "A real spirit exists at Chicago to get a winning football team." But, by that time, such optimistic announcements were in vain, as the University trustees had moved inexorably toward a decision for abolition.[25]

Persuasion in various forms preceded the trustees' final vote to abolish intercollegiate football. In a doctoral dissertation on the history of

Maroon football, Robin Lester noted that by September 1939, Hutchins' administrators favored dropping the sport but that the trustees needed convincing. According to Lester, Harold Swift, chairman of the Board, had by then adopted a neutral position on the issue, allowing John Nuveen, a younger trustee, to lead the search for a solution. Nuveen, also chairman of the Alumni Council, diligently investigated the football situation, and by the end of that disastrous season, he was willing to support administrative moves for abolition. Accordingly, both he and President Hutchins disseminated several anti-football documents among the other trustees. Nuveen also moved to dampen the ardor of football-minded alumni to recruit players, while arguing to fellow trustees that a majority of the alumni could be convinced to accept a vote for abolition.[26]

By early December Chairman Swift became receptive to Nuveen's views that the football issue had to be resolved forthwith, particularly before the beginning of a new alumni fund drive. The chairman therefore convened a meeting on December 21, and Hutchins opened this session by submitting the proposal for the abolition of intercollegiate football. (This proposal had been approved the previous day by the Board on Student Activities.) After listening to Hutchins' arguments of the beneficial aspects of abolition, and after lengthy discussion and soul-searching, the trustees finally concurred with Hutchins' proposal.[27]

The University of Chicago's action was undoubtedly the most famous case of abolition of the sport in college football history. The local media, however, generally accepted it as a "bang" followed by a "whimper." On December 22 news of the University's decision received sports page headlines in each of Chicago's major dailies, and for a few days following, it continued to dominate athletic news. Principal concern, however, centered more on speculation about Maroon participation in other collegiate sports rather than the abolition itself. But most sportswriters did not offer sympathy. Marvin McCarthy of the *Daily Times* wrote that "it is with particular regret that we say farewell to football at the University of Chicago."[28] Leo Fischer of the *Chicago American* wrote that the abolition announcement brought "a real pang to those of us who have followed the Midway teams through the fat and lean years," and he authored a sentimental 12-part series on the history of Maroon football. Lloyd Lewis of the *Chicago Daily News* was particularly forthright in arguing that Chicago was completely correct in deciding that "it cannot maintain side by side a competitive football team and an ideal system of scholarship."[29]

Only Colonel Robert McCormick's *Chicago Tribune* responded with criticism to the announcement of abolition. Wilfred Smith wrote with considerable exaggeration that "reaction on the campus and in alumni circles, both in Chicago and out of the metropolitan territory, was almost unanimously opposed to the action of the University trustees." Arch Ward, dean of Chicago sportswriters, listed past Maroon football greats

and then added reproachfully, "The school where they achieved gridiron immortality has abandoned the sport. . . . Can you imagine those men quitting when things were breaking badly? They belonged to an era when men were men and the University of Chicago wasn't afraid of competition." Although Colonel McCormick then held a particular dislike of President Hutchins, newspaper associates of Ward and Smith, and Ward's son Tom, believe that these *Tribune* sportswriters initiated such criticism on their own.[30]

Outside Chicago, many of the nation's newspapers commented on the University's decision, almost all of them applauding Chicago's action, and many of them offering special praise of the administration's courage. Of the several national magazines that commented on the decision, *Look's* (January 2, 1940) sportswriter Henry McLemore named eleven of the Maroon varsity as his "amateur All-American team for 1939."[31]

Many of America's most noted college coaches, particularly those at the Big Ten schools, expressed great dismay over Chicago's decision. Fritz Crisler, for example, was stunned by the decision, and William Morganstern remembers that the Michigan coach felt that his own job might have been threatened. Amos Stagg also expressed great regret over the news and told reporters, "I'm foolish enough to believe the action wouldn't have been taken had I been there." Like the "Grand Old Man," George Halas was also upset, and felt the decision was too rash, but he did not believe it marked the beginning of a trend.[32] Any remorse that Coach Clark Shaughnessy felt was probably dispelled by subsequent events. Shortly after the December announcement, "Shag" accepted the head coaching position at Stanford University, and Emil Hirsch recalls his statement upon departing Chicago: "You'll see me in the Rose Bowl." The words proved prophetic: During the 1940 football season Shaughnessy's unbeaten and untied "T" formation team, led by All-American Frankie Albert was perhaps the nation's best. "Shag" was named coach of the year, and his dazzling Stanford Indians defeated Nebraska 21-13 in the 1941 Rose Bowl.[33]

Besides the media and the nation's coaches, there were sharp reactions from within the University community. Sentiments ranged from astonishment and irritation to dismay and ultimate acceptance. Jay Berwanger was perhaps the most flabbergasted alumnus. He had just finished giving a speech on Chicago's north side, telling his audience that he had no knowledge of any plans for abolition, when he turned on his car radio to hear the startling news. Football captain John Davenport had also been embarrassed by the surprising announcement. On December 6, he had forecast at the annual football banquet: "In a few years, I'll be sitting up in the stands munching a hot dog and watching the mighty Maroons battling away as they did in days of old." Lew Hamity, the previous year's captain, was not taken aback in this same manner but, like Davenport, he felt that the abandonment of football broke a bond to the University.[34]

Many alumni and students were more bitter than shocked over the decision. One alumnus was quoted in the *Chicago American* as declaring sarcastically, "It's Mr. Hutchins' Christmas present to the athletic department." Another wrote more bitterly to Lloyd Lewis of the Chicago *Daily News*, "Kindly oblige the writer by presenting one large white feather to smart close-cropped President Maynard Hutchins and to that arty Harold Swift." Perhaps the most vindictive comment was that of a 1912 alumnus from Winnetka who declared that "the sophomoric decision of the board of trustees ignores the Bill of Rights and sincerely flatters both Stalin and Hitler."[35] On campus, fraternity men, who were the principal team boosters, suggested protest demonstrations and petitions to the trustees in order to get their decision rescinded. Several members of the varsity football team also gave dissenting statements to the press, but perhaps the most contentious words came from Robert Jamplis, a junior quarterback: "I don't think we ought to take this lying down. Neither do I think the action should have been taken while the student body was away. I think it's a slam on us players, and adds insult to injury." Jamplis, who is presently a surgeon and executive director of the Palo Alto Medical Clinic, still feels that "the University of Chicago made a great mistake in giving up intercollegiate football."[36]

Yet despite such dissent from football players, fraternity men and alumni, a majority of the University constituency came to accept the abandonment of football on the Midway. The *Chicago Daily News* reported after the announcement that "most of the faculty" backed the move by Hutchins and the trustees. Most of the non-fraternity members, who comprised the majority of undergraduates, also supported abolition. Fraternity men Emil Hirsch and John Paul Stevens were disappointed but supported the necessity of the decision. David Martin, chairman of the *Daily Maroon* declared, "I think dropping football is a good thing," and the paper ran an editorial on January 4, 1940 stating that if Chicago could keep "football alive only at the cost of destroying sportsmanship and the real purpose of colleges, then we are better off rid of football."[37] Alumni who favored the trustees' action also made their sentiments known. In the *University of Chicago Magazine*, Margery Parks (A.B., 1916) wrote of her "proud feeling to know that our University has taken such a stand in maintaining its integrity," and Edgar Dale (Ph.D., 1929) declared, "The University of Chicago is to be congratulated on its courage and insight in handling the problem of football." But perhaps the most incisive alumni comments were penned by Emmett Dedmon, former *Daily Maroon* chairman:

> I yelled myself hoarse on every autumn Saturday of my undergraduate days. I knew the number, weight, and idiosyncrasies of every regular and substitute. I was and still am, a football fan. But I should hate to think the abandonment of football should dissolve my affec-

tions for the University. Just as the University's fame is greater than that of one department so are its traditions and spirit much more than those of one sport. . . .[38]

It was President Robert Hutchins who provided the main impetus to defuse the situation. Most of the criticism against the abandonment of football had been leveled against the President, and Hutchins, noted for his directness, answered the censurers at an undergraduate assembly in Mandel Hall on January 12, 1940. First, the President denied that there was any conspiracy behind the abolition announcement being made during Christmas recess. He bluntly stated that the reason it "was announced on December 22 was that it was reached on December 21." Next, Hutchins declared that the attention given to Maroon football had "distracted attention from other games and our excellent program of intramural sports." He noted that many students and alumni had wanted "legal" subsidization for football, but he answered that this was something in which the University could not engage. Hutchins concluded his speech with a final argument for abandoning the sport: "By getting rid of football, by presenting the spectacle of a university that can be great without football, the University of Chicago may perform a signal service to higher education throughout the land." The speech may not have satisfied everyone, but the *Daily Maroon* noted in a poll taken 19 days later that a distinct majority of students were in accord with Hutchins' reasons for abolition.[39]

Any controversy after the abandonment of Maroon football faded by the spring of 1940 as students' interests turned to the upcoming American presidential election and the ominous European war news. In the autumn, intramural football was initiated and this generally remained the status of the game until the University reinstituted it as an intercollegiate sport in 1969 on a subordinate Division III level. (Chicago is presently the only one of the nation's five largest cities without a Division I team). The original Stagg Field achieved immortality in 1942 as the site of the development of the first nuclear chain reaction, and was subsequently demolished. Today the University's team plays its autumn contests on a newer, but smaller, Stagg Field in Hyde Park. But if smaller crowds and less publicity now greet their contests with teams such as Lake Forest, Grinnell and Carleton, Maroon players meet their opponents with the same spirit that once accompanied packed contests with Illinois and Michigan.[40]

Chicago's mayor of the late 1930's, "Big Ed" Kelly, allegedly referred to the last Maroon teams as "a bunch of losers," a description that was far from accurate. Those undergraduates who played on the teams captained by Lewis Hamity and John Davenport were, as Clark Shaughnessy called them, "a swell bunch of boys." They had shown courage and perseverance in the face of adversity and derision. They were out-

manned, overpowered and sometimes humiliated by the power-laden teams they played, and yet they resolutely returned to the next week's practice sessions. Walter Maurovitch, a tackle, seemed to capture their unbroken spirit when he told Coach Shaughnessy after the 1939 Michigan debacle: "Give us hell Coach, we need it!" These players had no athletic scholarships that obliged them to remain on the team, but as teammates Russell Parsons and Kenneth Jensen reminisced, we continued to play because "we loved the game and we weren't quitters."[41] When the World War that was already raging engulfed America, almost all of these Maroons served their country with similar resolve, and some, like Ed Valorz, John Stearns and Bill Leach sacrificed their lives. Today, many of them have achieved considerable respect and success in business, government, and the professions. "Losers," Big Ed? No, not these men, they and the university they represented were real winners!

Bibliography

Articles:

Tom Bennett, "Football's Grand Old Man," in *Pro Football* Magazine (October, 1978).

Robert M. Hutchins, "Gate Receipts and Glory," in *Saturday Evening Post* (December 3, 1938).

Henry McLemore, "McLemore's All-America Football Team is . . . The University of Chicago," in *Look Magazine* (January 2, 1940).

Books:

Allison Danzig, *The History of American Football: Its Great Teams, Players, and Coaches*. (1956).

Mervin D. Hyman and Gordon S. White, Jr. *Big Ten Football: Its Life and Times, Great Coaches, Players and Games* (1977).

John McCallum, *Big Ten Football Since 1895* (1976).

William M. Murphy and D.J.R. Bruckner, *The Idea of the University of Chicago: Selections from the Papers of the First Eight Chief Executives of the University of Chicago from 1891 to 1975*. (1976).

Alexander M. Weyland, *The Saga of American Football* (1955).

Doctoral Dissertation:

Robin Lester, The Rise Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, 1890-1940. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, (1974).

Magazines:

Pulse (Monthly Student Magazine, University of Chicago). 1937-1940.

The University of Chicago Magazine, 1937-1941.

Newspapers:

Chicago American, 1938-1940.

Chicago Daily Maroon, 1936-1940, 1969, 1978.

Chicago Daily News, 1922-1924, 1935, 1938-1940.

Chicago Daily Times, 1938-1940.

Chicago Tribune, 1922-1924, 1934-35, 1938-40.

Personal and Written Interviews:

Mr. Kyle J. Anderson, Former Assistant Coach, University of Chicago.

Mr. James Atkins, Former University of Chicago Football Player.

Mr. John Bernhardt, Former Student, University of Chicago.

Mr. John Jay Berwanger, Former Football Player and Freshman football coach, University of Chicago.

The Reverend Charles J. Carmody, S.J., Faculty member, Loyola University of Chicago.

Mr. Dave Condon, Sports Dept. *Chicago Tribune*.

Mr. John L. Davenport, Former University of Chicago Football Captain.

Mr. Emmett Dedmon, Former Chairman, *Chicago Daily Maroon*.

Judge Robert Jerome Dunne (retd.) Former University of Chicago Assistant Football Coach.

Mr. Robert Greenebaum, Former Football Player, University of Chicago.

Mr. George Halas, President, Chicago Bears.

Mr. Lewis Hamity, Former Football Captain, University of Chicago.

Mr. Emil Hirsch, Former Editor, *Pulse*.

Dr. Robert W. Jamplis, Former University of Chicago Football player.

Mr. Kenneth Jensen, Former University of Chicago Football player.

Mr. James S. Kearns, Former Sportswriter, *Chicago Daily News*.

Professor Paul Kiniery, Professor Emeritus, Loyola University of Chicago.

Professor William H. McNeill, Former Chairman, *Chicago Daily Maroon*. Presently Robert A. Milliken, Distinguished service Professor, University of Chicago.

Father James J. Mertz, S.J. Professor Emeritus, Loyola University of Chicago.

Mr. Harold A. Metcalf, Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Athletics, University of Chicago.

Ms. Alice I. Meyer, Former Editor, *Chicago Daily Maroon*.

Mr. Thomas Moore, Former sportswriter, *Chicago Tribune*.

Mr. William V. Morganstern, Former Secretary of University and Director of Public Relations, University of Chicago.

Mr. Russell Parsons, Former University of Chicago Football player.

Professor Edward W. Rosenheim, University of Chicago, Former Editor of *Pulse*.

Mr. Morris Rossin, Former University of Chicago Basketball player, presently Associate Director of Development University of Chicago.

Mr. Saul Sherman, Former University of Chicago Football player.

Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens, Former student University of Chicago.

Mr. Tom Ward, United States Steel, Son of Arch Ward.

Mr. Donald Wilson, Former Football player University of Chicago.

Notes

[1] *Chicago Tribune, Chicago Daily News, Chicago American, Chicago Daily Times*, December 22, 1939.

[2] Mervin D. Hyman and Gordon S. White, *Big Ten Football: Its Life and Times, Great Coaches, Players and Games*, (New York: MacMillan, 1977), pp. 29-109; Robin Lester, The Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, 1890-1940, Unpublished PhD. Dissertation, pp. 36-63.

[3] Tom Bennett, "Football's Grand Old Man," *Pro Football* Magazine, (October 1978), pp. 20-40; Lester, Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, pp. 28-159.

[4] Oral interviews, William Morganstern, (October 22, 1978), George Halas, (March 17, 1979); Lester, Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, pp. 160-162.

[5] *Chicago Daily News*, October 22-29, 1922, November 2-10, 1924; *Chicago Tribune*, October 22-29, November 2-10, 1924.

[6] Lester, Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, pp. 190-204, 300-301.

[7] Hyman and White, *Big Ten Football*, pp. 88-89; Lester, pp. 205-230.

[8] Oral interviews, Judge Robert J. Dunne, (October 25, 1978), James S. Kearn, (December 1, 1978); Hyman and White, *Big Ten Football*, pp. 246-250; Lester, Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, pp. 231-234.

[9] Oral interview, Jay Berwanger, (June 2, 1979); Lester, Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, p. 303.

[10] Letter to Author from Justice John Paul Stevens, (December 12, 1978); Oral interview, Professor William McNeill, (November 3, 1978); *University of Chicago Daily Maroon*, September-November, 1937.

[11] *University of Chicago Daily Maroon*, November 22, 1938; Oral interview, Emmett Dedmon, (January 11, 1979).

[12] *University of Chicago Daily Maroon*, October-November, 1938; *Pulse Magazine*, September 1938, pp. 3-4; Robert M. Hutchins, "Gate Receipts and Glory," *Saturday Evening Post*, (December 3, 1978), p. 34ff.

[13] Lester, Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, p. 249.

[14] Ibid., pp. 247-248, 303.

[15] *Chicago Tribune*, November 23, 1938; *University of Chicago Magazine*, December, 1938, pp. 3-5.

[16] *University of Chicago* Daily Maroon, October 1, 1939; *Chicago Tribune*, September 12, 1939.

[17] Oral interview, Donald Wilson, (February 1, 1980); *Chicago Tribune*, *Chicago Daily News*, September-November, 1939.

[18] Letter to Author from Ms Alice Meyer, (February 2, 1979).

[19] *University of Chicago Daily Maroon*, October 30, November 3, 1939.

[20] Oral interview, Emil Hirsch, (December 12, 1978).

[21] *Chicago Tribune*, November 1, 1939.

[22] Oral interview, William Morganstern, (October 17, 1978); *Chicago Daily News*, October 29, 1939, November 4, 1939; *Chicago Tribune*, November 19, 1939.

[23] Oral interview, William Morganstern.

[24] Oral interview, Jay Berwanger; Lester, Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, pp. 261-264.

[25] Lester, Rise, Decline and Fall of Football at the University of Chicago, pp. 259-60, 264-265.

[26] Ibid., pp. 246-47, 255-57.

[27] Ibid., 264-267.

[28] *Chicago Daily Times*, December 22, 1939.

[29] *Chicago American*, December 22, 1939; *Chicago Daily News*, December 22, 1939.

[30] *Chicago Tribune*, December 22, 1939.

[31] *Look Magazine*, January 2, 1940, pp. 24-26.

[32] Oral interview, George Halas; *Chicago Tribune*, December 23, 1939.

[33] Oral interview, Emil Hirsch.

[34] Oral interviews, Lewis Hamity, (November 5, 1978); John Davenport, (January 22, 1979); Jay Berwanger op cit.

[35] *Chicago American*, December 26, 1939; *Chicago Daily News*, December 28, 1939; *Chicago Tribune*, December 26, 1939.

[36] *Chicago Tribune*, December 22, 1939; Letter to Author from Dr. Robert Jamplis, (December 27, 1978).

[37] *Chicago Daily News*, December 22, 1939; *University of Chicago Daily Maroon*, January 4, 1940.

[38] *University of Chicago Magazine*, February-March, 1940.

[39] William M. Murphy and D.J.R. Bruckner, *The Idea of the University of Chicago: Selections from the Papers of the First Chief Executives of the University of Chicago from 1891 to 1975*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), pp. 221-224.

[40] Oral interview, Mr. Harold Metcalf, (April 11, 1979).

[41] Oral interviews, Father James Mertz, S.J., (September 20, 1978); Russell Parsons, (December 5, 1979); *University of Chicago Daily Maroon*, October 31, 1939.

PART II

Educational Thought

William Rainey Harper: Christian Individualism and the University of Chicago

David B. Owen
University of Chicago

Although William Rainey Harper, the intellectual founder and first president of the University of Chicago, is commonly viewed as one of the more influential figures in the creation of the modern American university, his life has received surprisingly little thoughtful analysis since his death in January 1906, at the age of fifty. In the March 1906, memorial issue of *Biblical World*, a journal he had founded in 1882 as *The Hebrew Student* and edited continuously until his death, numerous men who had known him gave glowing testimony to his powers and accomplishments, ranking him among the finest in his various capacities as teacher of languages, Hebrew scholar, and university administrator. Yet with his death, a strange indifference, at times even hostility, to his career has arisen among commentators on American higher education during the late 19th century.

In the year of Harper's death, Charles F. Thwing, President of Western Reserve University, published *A History of Higher Education in America:* Harper receives no mention, while extended coverage is given to Daniel Coit Gilman, Andrew Dixon White, Charles W. Eliot and their respective institutions.[1] Four years later, Edwin E. Slosson's *Great American Universities* appeared: Chicago is one of fourteen universities considered and receives special praise for its introduction of summer education, extension work, and the separation of junior college from university (or graduate) work; yet Harper himself, the source of these innovations, gets little attention.[2] In 1927, Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, a friend of Harper's for 28 years, wrote the only full-length biography of Harper: though an admirer, Goodspeed provides little beyond the chronology of events in his subject's life; one is grateful for even this effort because Goodspeed was 85 at the time and died before he could finish his first draft.[3]

The only other extended treatment of Harper appears in Richard J. Storr's *Harper's University: The Beginnings*.[4] Here, Storr takes two pages to discuss Harper's life prior to 1887, when, at 31, he first met John D. Rockefeller, Chicago's prominent early benefactor. In his analysis of Harper's subsequent life, Storr views Harper as, in general, a man of action, a pragmatic agent with little formal intellectual capacity and limited sensitivity to action derived from principle. As Storr describes him,

> Harper's mind was powerful, but it was not speculative: Harper was a theologian only in the limited sense that he taught students of divinity. As a scholar he did not build a systematic philosophy of God, man, or truth; and as a university president he did not deduce the elements of the institution placed under his care from an idea or formal theory about the universe and the ways men seek to understand it. Rather, his manner of working was inductive, a word which he used constantly. His plan was a mosaic, the bits of which were cemented into a pattern by a generalization derived from a single case, his own life as an investigator and teacher of the Bible.[5]

Storr's view of Harper as a dynamic and rather unreflective man of affairs characterizes most recent interpretations. Frederick Rudolph's *The American College and University: A History* defines Harper's three contributions to higher education as the addition of a summer quarter, the division of collegiate work between junior and senior colleges, and the concentration of study on one major and one minor.[6] Yet these innovations would scarcely lead a reader to conclude, as Rudolph does, that Harper was "one of the great and memorable men in the history of American education," one whose name ranks with Jefferson, Wayland, White, Eliot and Gilman.[7] Harper as the source of the junior college certainly has received attention; indeed, that is the only reference of substance that R. Freeman Butts and Laurence A. Cremin make to him in *A History of Education in American Culture*.[8]

Aside from this connection with the junior college movement, Harper's contribution at Chicago is often seen as the translation of Chautauqua, where he was active in the 1880's, into an urban setting. Joseph E. Gould's *The Chautauqua Movement: An Episode in the Continuing American Revolution* finds a striking "organizational parallel" between Harper's plans for the University as set forth in the six Official Bulletins of 1891-92 and various Chautauqua plans and practices of the previous decade.[9] Gould, however, carries his analysis a step further and articulates what may well be the most common perception of Harper.

> Although the two institutions looked similar on paper, they were actually quite different in outlook. One can trace Harper's emphasis on continuous sessions, concentrated doses of study, publication, correspondence work, lecture-study, and adult education to his connection with the Chautauqua movement. However, the articulation of these elements into a single plan for formal higher education, and his system for the administration of that plan, seem to be related less to his Chautauqua experience than to his belief that the advances made in his lifetime in the field of industrial organization should be applicable to higher education.[10]

This is Harper the educational entrepreneur, the manager of scholarly and pedagogical production, the Rockefeller of academia "attempting to build an educational 'Trust.' "[11]

The most corrosive commentary so far on Harper is in Laurence R. Veysey's *The Emergence of the American University*, where Harper becomes, literally, a "caricature," a man whose "personality meaningfully if at times almost comically caricatures the traits of the rising new group of academic executives."[12] His University

> represented a blending of the small-town promotional spirit of the adolescent Middle West with big-city standards of sophistication. . . . In short, the tone was one of institutional evangelism.[13]

Harper himself is seen as "charisma without ideology":

> Harper, it is usually agreed, was a man of unparalleled intensity of vision; yet, like the other 'new' administrators of the nineties, he was basically untouched by the power of abstract ideas.[14]

Veysey's psychological analysis of "the mainsprings of such a mind" explores Harper's building of the new University:

> 'Building' in this context is meant neither architecturally nor philosophically, but in a third and possibly intermediate sense. It involves the act of seeing, stretched forth as it were on a gigantic canvas, a huge network of lines, arranged with order and precision (and yet with fascinating variety) into an aesthetically pleasing shape, like the out-of-scale maps one sometimes sees in railroad timetables. The lines here represent the invisible relations between the units of a sprawling organization. Some are darker, some fainter; some solid, some subtly dotted. To place these lines correctly and with flair requires the hand of an artist. That artist is the creative administrator.[15]

Lest his audience miss his point, Veysey summarizes the motives of this mind as "an unreasoning delight in the manipulation of rationally related units."[16]

Let me conclude this brief survey of treatments of Harper by noting that, indeed, institutional, economic, and psychological analyses may all help illumine the actions of a man. Yet glaringly absent in treatments of Harper's character is any attempt to examine seriously his ideas in terms of what *he* thought he was doing. In the absence of such examination of conscious purposes, the evaluation of any man's life tends either toward unreflective praise and blame of actions taken or toward motivational analysis of institutional demands, economic interests, and psychological

pushes and pulls that force a man in one direction as opposed to another. At the heart of the issue raised here is, of course, the profound question of the nature and possibility of freedom, of man's ability to initiate actions without external restraint. I cannot treat that question now; all I wish to do in this essay is to call attention to a major portion of Harper's life, namely, his ideas. In so doing, I hope to suggest that more ground exists for considering Harper as "one of the great and memorable men in the history of American education" than merely his personal charisma or his organizational flair.

In reading Harper's writings, notably the speeches and articles collected in *Religion and the Higher Life* and *The Trend in Higher Education*,[17] I have sensed a continuity in his underlying assumptions, a continuity that to me implies a man with a vigorous, consistent, philosophic vision of the world. I do not mean to imply that Harper was a formal philosopher; after all, he made no extended statement of his philosophic views. Nevertheless, his training and experience as linguist, historian of the Old Testament, and educator led him to consider deeply the assumptions behind men's thoughts and actions. How, then, can one uncover his philosophic stance when he was himself never explicit as to its full nature, when his writings contain such a diversity of observation that they appear to prohibit an unified, animating vision?

This essay represents a first step in answering this question. I will examine two of Harper's articles, distinguishing the main topics in each and the structure of thought that defines each topic. The articles I have selected are those in which he makes comprehensive statements regarding religion and the possibilities of human thought and action. My contention is that these articles reflect a man's stance in relation to the world about him which is reflective, consistent, and capable of generating penetrating observations on a diversity of subjects. The final test of the validity of such topical analysis would lie, of course, in the examination of all of Harper's thought, a process beyond this paper's scope. Yet even the brief review contained herein of a third article by Harper, one on education, suggests that my original sense of continuity and fruitfulness in his work has relevance when one looks at his conception of the university and that his arguments reveal an unsuspected vitality and insight into fundamental problems of human experience.[18]

The first article I want to treat is "Religion and the Higher Life."[19] Harper begins with history.

> It was a great moment in the history of spiritual progress when the *individual* man became a factor; for till that moment came the ascent of man was largely physical. But when man the individual came to be fully recognized, when what he was or might be had for its largest determining element himself, then modern civilization had its

beginning. The powers and the possibilities of the individual, as distinguished from those of the family, the clan, or the nation; the responsibility of the individual, as distinguished from that of the family, the clan, or the nation — these constitute the real basis of substantial growth; these furnish the true incentive toward forward movement; these supply the elements required for the realization of the higher life.

The higher life — beginning with the first steps of civilization, inseparably related to the effort of the individual man, and taking on higher and higher form as individual effort became more distinct and determinative — has manifested itself in widely varied, yet closely related, forms of thought and action; and the characteristics of these forms, always plainly discernible, distinguish it from that which is below, and also from that which we may call the highest. (P. 1)

What is this history about? It is about spirit, and Harper begins defining its human aspect by making a series of distinctions based on the commonplace, internal/external. At first, men developed only as physical beings; that is, external factors, whether strictly material or also social, controlled their lives. Only later, when a man was able to exercise choice independent of the impingement of external, physical (including social) forces, was he making internal, or spiritual, decisions. This capacity of individual choice is the mark of modern civilization, what he styles as "the higher life." This spiritual individual, moreover, combines two aspects: powers and possibilities on the one hand and responsibilities on the other. Choice, then, entails not only the existence of alternatives with a capacity to select among them, but also the recognition that such selection has consequences of which one must take account. Harper identifies the manifestations of these spiritual choices as occurring in forms either of "thought" or of "action"; and in proportion as each individual actively exercises choice in thought and action, so will he partake of the higher, spiritual life. It is not surprising to find in this context a great emphasis upon "individual effort": the power to initiate thought and action is obviously a principle of the individual, of the higher life, of spirit. This concept of initiatory power — power that creates possibilities, chooses among them, and then executes its choice — is closely related to the issue of freedom, and this passage will take on additional importance when further on we examine his concept of freedom.

Turning to those "forms of thought and action" that manifest the higher life, Harper analyzes such forms by reference to individual agents who represent them. He finds three types of men: artists, who "have created works which have lifted not only themselves, the doers of the work, into the higher life, but likewise all of their fellow-men who have sincerely sympathized with such work and entered into its appreciation;"

philosophers (including scientists), who "have made gigantic efforts to secure knowledge and to ascertain the origin of things and their relations;" and moral agents, "every man who endeavors to live a righteous life, to be honest and pure; every man who puts forth energy to perform his obligations as a member of a family, as a member of society, as a citizen of the state" (pp. 2-3). To give this distinction its most general topical formulation, the forms that manifest spirit in men's lives are here separated into activities characterized by passion, thought, and action. The order in which these spiritual activities are presented is not accidental, either. Philosophy and science, for example, comprise "a sphere broader, perhaps higher and deeper, than that of art; but less attractive to the ordinary man, and certainly more difficult to appreciate" (p. 2). In addition, "the sphere of moral effort is, after all, the one in which all others are contained; with which all the others are identified" (p. 3). Thus, the list of spiritual activities, progressing from art through philosophy to morals, is based on an increase in scope. Though the conception may appear arbitrary at this point, we will discover its foundation when we review his notion of history and progress.

Though every individual may potentially engage in such activities, the latter do not form an absolute standard for judging the quality of spirit in any individual.

> The line between the higher and the lower life is not the same for any two individuals. If, for any reason, we permit ourselves to dwell, either intellectually or morally, on a lower plane than the very highest which nature and our environment have made possible, we live the lower life. It is only the man who lives *the highest life possible for him to live*, that may be said to live the higher life; the failure, at any time, to put forth his utmost endeavor — a failure of which in every case he is unquestionably conscious — degrades him, from a higher to a lower position. (Pp. 3-4)

Again, the specifics of each man's life are the grounds of judgment: given the limits of one's powers endowed at birth and the limits of one's physical, social and intellectual circumstances at a particular time and place, an individual is spiritually alive to the extent he chooses and initiates activities that will responsibly develop his powers of thought and action.

Having sketched an outline of this higher life of the spirit, Harper continues:

> Do those of us who are associated with university work sustain any peculiar or special relation to this constituency which lives, or tries to live, the higher life? Yes, a double relation; in that, first of all, we make public profession of membership. . . . And, further, in this

act we proclaim ourselves leaders in this life. (P. 4)

The members of the university, whether artists, philosophers, moralists, or students of these endeavors, whether leaders or novices, all are involved with issues of the higher life, issues of spirit. Thus, the university is an institution peculiarly situated to benefit the higher life: it "should furnish the highest ideals for life, and by its discipline make possible examples of the highest type of living" (p. 5).

At this point, the discussion of the higher life turns to the question, "What has religion to do with the higher life?" (p. 5) Why does this question arise now? The answer to both questions, regarding the content and the structure of the argument, reveals the philosophic assumptions regarding the character of human knowledge that Harper makes throughout his essays. Here he proceeds carefully.

First, he distinguishes religion from the church.

> In the use of the word 'religion' I am not thinking of the church, for the church is of a transitory and variable character; she takes on different forms at different periods of her growth and under different environments, and at times, and in certain places passes out of sight; while religion is something as imperishable as the mind itself, of which it is a necessary condition; something that is permanent and not a mere passing phenomenon.
>
> Religion, as has been said, is a condition of the mind; but, in its outward form, it is a kind of life; in fact, the life which is the outcome of the mental condition. Religion, therefore, takes on many forms and in each case that form which is best adapted to the state or phase of development already attained by the person or community concerned. (P. 6)

Harper is here using the commonplace of permanence and change to reveal the distinction he has in mind. It is crucial that he characterize both religion and mind as imperishable and permanent, though the former is in some sense a precondition of the latter. In addition, the earlier internal/external commonplace reappears, with the inner form, the mental condition or mind, distinct from, but causative of, the outward form, the actions that embody a "kind of life." Harper is working in a tradition of interpretation of experience — in this case, religious experience — that leads back to Plato, who sought to distinguish appearance, the manifold and changing matter of life, from reality, the unitary and permanent form of rational order or being. In raising this Platonic comparison, I am not suggesting that Harper is using a dialectical method to investigate his subject; rather, that his perception of the nature of experience requires a search beyond the phenomena of daily life for a source that causes these

phenomena, one that exists independently and permanently as a quality of mind. Thus, the actions of an individual's life and of human institutions, insofar as those actions are religious, spiritual, or part of the higher life, partake of a form that is a reflection of that individual's "mental condition," of a mind that is in some sense eternal.

Since Harper has now characterized the relation of mind and action in the higher life and identified religion as a necessary condition of mind, he can turn to the question of the relation between, on the one hand, mind and action and, on the other, religion. At this point the argument proceeds by refutation through three points. In the first, he states,

> I am not one of those who would ask a place for religion in the higher life upon the ground that each of the different phases of this life, whether art, philosophy, science, or ethics, owes its origin to religion. This contention cannot be maintained. (P. 7)

In the second, he finds,

> Religion, then, is something in itself and for itself, fulfilling a separate role, and not in any ways to be confounded with art, or philosophy, or even with morality. (P. 9)

Viewing the relation in terms of cause and effect, he presents religion as neither prior to nor identical with the higher life (nor, as he implies, posterior to it). Given that religion coexists independent of, but not in any causal relation to, the higher life, his third point notes that "there are many who think that religion has been and is the enemy of the higher life as exhibited in art, philosophy, science, and morality" (p. 9). He rejects this view by making "certain distinctions," namely, that one must not confuse instances of hostility between religion and art, philosophy (including science) and morality with antagonism in principle (pp. 10-11). In logical form, these three points show, first, that religion is independent of the higher life and thus stands in some relation to it; second, that the relation is not one of antecedent/consequent, one being derived from the other; and third, that the relation does not reflect an essential struggle between the two, a fundamental opposition. Logically, then, we are left with a relation between two coexistent concepts based on harmony.

Having systematically refuted the misconceptions of conventional views regarding this relation, Harper employs an analogy to characterize in positive terms the relation he has in mind.

> But if religion does not furnish the starting-point, is not the origin of this higher life; if religion is something quite independent of one or all of the phases of this life; and if religion is not the enemy of art, science, philosophy, and ethics, how shall the relationship be desig-

nated? Perhaps religion may be called the sister; and, if a sister, surely the oldest member of the family. (p. 11).

We should not be deceived by the poetic imagery of familial harmony; Harper has a precise idea in mind.

> The fact, after all, which at the same time marks the relationship and the separation, which makes it impossible for religion to be taken as the mother, or to have one or another of these take her place, is this: in art the imagination and emotion predominate; in science, the intellect and judgment; in morality, the will; while in religion these various faculties must be held in an even balance. Undue emphasis on any one or another results in an abnormal and degenerate form, such as mysticism, or fanaticism, or moralism. Religion, many-sided, and well-rounded, is broader than any of its sister-forms of spirituality. It calls into exercise a man's whole being; and when its development is normal, it strengthens every function of his life. (P. 13)

His analysis draws its terms from faculty psychology, a conception popular in 19th century thought, but it is used here in a fashion that indicates it is no mere convention. When Harper wishes to define characteristically human activities, he turns not to men's behavior (as a pragmatist might), to their symbolic inventions (as a linguistic philosopher might), or to their relations with the objects of the world (as a materialist might); rather, he finds their essential quality to lie in the powers of mental activity. These he groups into three kinds based on their purpose: those directed at creation, as evidenced in art by imagination and emotion; at knowledge, as evidenced in science (and philosophy) by intellect and judgment; and at action, as evidenced in morality by will. It is worth noting that this analysis of how men think is based on the topical distinction of passion, thought, and action, respectively, the same distinction which governed Harper's historical analysis of what men do, of the kinds of individuals leading the higher life.

After distinguishing the three basic mental faculties and noting their characteristic degradations (emotion may become mysticism, thought fanaticism, and action moralism), he observes that religion is the harmonious "exercise" of all three, a co-ordinated balance which is broader in scope than any of the individual faculties. Indeed, this comprehensive activity of mental faculties is "a man's whole being," one that "strengthens every function of his life." Harper's conception of religion as a comprehensive principle of all activity, mental and physical, and his characterization of it as the co-ordinated balance of human powers of passion, thought, and action, both place him firmly in a tradition that derives from Plato. In the *Republic*, Book IV, Plato divides the soul into desires, reason, and *θυμόσ* (Thymos), or purposive action; and he finds

that justice is each part of the soul doing its proper work (*Rep.* 441D). Harper has translated this conception of human psychology and action into a Christian theological context. Moreover, as in Plato, the reflexive relation between the analytic parts of the soul and their proper functioning provides for mutual reinforcement and increase in power. Harper schematically provides instances of how religion both complements and supplements the separate faculties. First, he indicates how religion is necessary to strengthen the inadequacy of art, science, and morality. For example,

> The artist cannot be a scientist and thus strengthen his intellect and judgment; he would only destroy his power as an artist; but he may cultivate the frame of mind which constitutes religion, and in this way obtain something of which he stands much in need. (P. 13)

Second, he remarks on how religion enhances each faculty in its *own* strength. For example,

> Art, then, if it will, may find in religion its closest friend and neighbor, for there can be no religion without sentiment, the essential element in art. (P. 14)

Harper's statements firmly establish the philosophic principles of his psychology: mental activity, whether in emotive, theoretic, or practical form, is what constitutes human nature and is necessary for the proper development of all other human activities. Moreover, this theory of mind implies that the mental faculties are not wholly separable; the distinction among them is based on one or another predominating in mental activity, not on one being exercised to the exclusion of, or in the absence of, the others. He is careful not to make these capacities into materially identifiable entities, as faculty psychology did when it joined with phrenology to identify specific portions of the skull as associated, for example, with "imagination" or "memory." Harper conceives of the mind as a seamless mental activity, one which may take on various aspects as the dominating power varies among thinking, feeling, doing, or the harmonious balance of all three, but activity which can never be fully accounted for by the mere addition of those aspects.

Harper concludes his essay by using the distinctions he has made to list six characteristics which those active in the higher life should expect in a religion adapted to that life. Relative to thought, the religion should be simple ("truth is always simple") and reasonable; relative to sentiment, it should be idealistic and comforting; relative to action, it should be tolerant and ethical (pp. 15-16). It is worth noting that having made a psychological definition of religion and of the higher life, Harper has the grounds for reflecting back upon particular religions and making judgments about what features are best adapted to specific circumstances. It is not surprising, then, that as a Baptist he closes with an exhortation to

consider Christianity as the most appropriate religion of the age; yet his plea rests not on a simple-minded proselyting but on a perception that returns his reader to the initial view of human history and the individual.

> I do not urge upon you any special *form* of this religion, for I have in mind its very essence. . . . This, as found in the teaching of Jesus, is, in the words of old Hebrew philosophy, the fear of the Lord — *i.e.*, belief in and acceptance of One who has power to help, even to the uttermost. (P. 20)

What Harper appears to have in mind is God as the perfect individual, one who is gifted with ultimate power and exercises that power "to the uttermost" to maximize possibilities, and who acts responsibly, "to help." In history, the follower of this model, the man moved by "fear of the Lord," is that individual, in other words, who makes civilization, one who exercises the power to initiate thoughtful action within circumstantial possibilities and who accepts the responsibilities consequent upon such action.

"Religion and the Higher Life" is a good example of Harper's thought: what at first, because of the brevity of exposition, may appear to be a series of religious pieties and platitudes is, upon inspection, a carefully considered view of the subject at hand, one that reflects the consistent development of what are ultimately philosophic issues.

I would like now to consider another chapter of *Religion and the Higher Life*, called "The Religious Spirit." He begins this essay with a distinction between "the religious spirit" and its manifestations in individuals and nations. This is the distinction between reality and appearance we earlier saw explored in the relation between religion and the church. Here Harper expounds on the transitory, circumstantial, individual manifestations of religion which go beyond even the varieties of churches. He begins:

> The religious side of man's nature will always furnish new and fresh material for study. Every manifestation of the religious spirit, whether in the individual or in the nation, deserves careful examination and consideration; and these manifestations are as numerous and as varied as are the individuals and the nations in which they appear. It may be said, with truth, that there is a religious spirit for every individual, and, in a slightly different sense, a religious spirit for every closely connected group of individuals.
>
> The differences which may be noted are so striking and so bewildering in our contemplation of them that one may fairly question the propriety of using such a term as 'the religious spirit.' . . . [Not

only are there vast differences between individuals and nations,] but more that this is true: the religious spirit in individual and in nation is always changing. The spirit of the child is not that of the mature man, and the latter, in turn, differs from that of the man of old age. The same man exhibiting the spirit in one form, in this environment, will, if suddenly transferred to other surroundings, make a quite different manifestation. (P. 21-22)

We can see how far Harper is willing to take his conception of individualism. We have a radical circumstantiality where each man, with his powers and possibilities and with his responsibilities, differs in his activities from *all* other men; not only that, he differs from himself as a being in the past or in the future. In a sense, Harper is preaching the doctrine: Each man his own religion. How does he keep this conception of continual flux from becoming a Sophist's relativism, where all values are merely matters of opinion, of perspective?

This problem is resolved by his appearance/reality interpretation of experience, and it is to the source of this variety in phenomenal appearances, to the reality that these appearances manifest, that he now directs his attention.

There are three elements which enter into the religious spirit, and which may be said to constitute it. The presence of these three elements, in varying proportions, determines largely the nature of the religious spirit in any particular case. The first of these elements may be expressed in the single term 'worship.' This term means here the attitude of an individual, or a group of individuals, toward the outside and higher world of supernatural or divine existence. It includes the outward acts which in various forms symbolize the inward thought. . . . Now one may ask: Does the thought precede the act and determine it, or does the act waken the thought which it is supposed to represent? At different times and under different circumstances each of these things happens. We must suppose that in the institution of any particular form or act in a ritual of worship, whether simple or elaborate, the intention and effort were to embody in a tangible form some conception suggested by the religious spirit; and that in the mind of individuals possessing a sensitive temperament, and controlled by the same general influences, the performance of the act would later produce that phase of feeling, or reflect that phase of thought, which originally suggested, whether consciously or unconsciously, the institution of the ceremony. (Pp. 22-24)

When Harper turns to the "three elements" which constitute the source of the manifestations of the religious spirit, he turns to mental

activities; in fact, he uses the same analytic distinctions between passion, thought, and action that he did when describing the character of religion and of the higher life. Here the "art" of the earlier exposition is transformed into "worship," and in describing the latter Harper reveals more clearly his conception of the productive faculties, formerly identified as imagination and emotion. He first describes worship as the "attitude" toward divinity; in other words, the essential character is mental activity of a certain kind. Here, again, the analysis is from the outside inward. To distinguish what this kind of thought is, he notes that its inner character is symbolized by "outward acts." Two things are noteworthy at this point. First is that he is treating human action as caused by mental activity, as being purposive. Second, the particular acts here considered have a character independent of the action performed: they stand for, are symbols of, thought. As such, they have a meaning other than what they are in themselves, a meaning related to an interior "feeling" or "thought." Thus, the "particular form or act," which embodies "in tangible form some conception suggested by the religious spirit," is related to the mental "attitude" in the same manner as the art object was earlier related to the mental powers of imagination and emotion. It is significant that a reflexive relation exists here between thought and action: thought may symbolically express itself in an act, yet such an act may also, when sensitively and intelligently perceived, give rise to the thought that was originally the source of the act. In sum, his psychological interpretation of experience has allowed him to transform a theory of art into a theory of worship.

In the same fashion, he proceeds to translate philosophy and morals into a religious framework to obtain the other two elements of the religious spirit. The intellectual and judgmental faculties are expressed here as "belief or faith" (p. 25), that is, as theology. The third element is "the ethical standard of a man's life — one's conduct in relation to himself and to his fellow-men" (p. 26), or the expression of the faculty of will.

As earlier, none of the faculties in this religious context act in isolation. As was noted in worship, thought can both determine and be determined by actions and institutions. Similarly, belief "is never quite independent of the first element. Thus, in most cases, it determines sooner or later, the *form* of worship" (p. 25). This relation of belief and worship, thought and symbolic act, is neither simple nor fixed, a crucial point in later analyses of the complex, fluid relation between the two. In the case at hand,

> a simple faith or belief, however, is by no means always found with a simple form of worship; and a complicated ceremonial does not necessarily presuppose, on the part of the ordinary worshiper, a more fully developed theological system. (P. 25)

Finally, the ethical element

> may not be entirely separated from either of the other two. . . . Thus the form of worship may be the strongest possible incentive toward either right living or wrong living. One's belief, however, may exert an even stronger influence upon conduct than one's ritual. . . . Character, it must be conceded, is largely determined by belief. (P. 26)

A significant result flows from this last perception, one that influences Harper's conception of how knowledge is attained (which we shall shortly see) and also his conception of individualism and the progressive nature of history, a notion that introduced his first article. As he states here,

> It is to be noted, however, that the element of belief does not now occupy the same position that it once did. A man's life, at least in civilized countries, is not dependent upon his theological belief, as it once was. . . . In other words, the present is an age of toleration, with which no past age of history may be compared. Though at first it may seem paradoxical, it is true that in proportion as less emphasis is placed upon a particular form of belief, greater emphasis is laid upon conduct. In proportion as larger liberty of thought, within reasonable limits, prevails, ethical standards will be elevated. (P. 27)

Implied here is a conception of freedom as growing from a variety in thought, not in action, from a structured, not arbitrary, intellectual innovation that permits, even necessitates, a subsequent increased ethicality of action. Thus, the story of history might be seen as the growth of liberty, of variety in thought, not thought for its own sake but rather that for the perfection of action. In this context, freedom embodies a complex relation of initiation and perfection on the part of individuals.

Having shown us the nature of the religious spirit, the permanent elements manifested in the varying phenomena of our experience, Harper gives us a dynamic representation of this nature. He turns to history.

> The history of religion furnishes us some interesting facts touching the mutual relationship of these three elements in the progress of their development. In the ancient religions only the element of worship existed. There was no dogma. . . . There may have been several accounts of the origin of a given ceremony. It made no difference what the worshiper believed in reference to the ceremony, if only he performed it regularly and accurately. . . . In these ancient religions, of course, the ethical standard was very low. The religious spirit, therefore, found its manifestation almost exclu-

> sively in the acts of ritual service. At a later period the element of faith or belief was introduced. . . . It was when the prophets of the Old Testament began to preach one God as against many gods that religion, as we are acquainted with it, first really emphasized belief. . . . Briefly, then, the religious spirit of the Old Testament shows itself most largely in the act of worship. The Levitical [*i.e.*, priestly] service occupied the largest share in the attention of the people. Then in the work of the prophets the elements of belief and right living were introduced and inculcated. In the later days the sages, who held a broader point of view than that of the prophets, gave practically all of their thought, as religious teachers, to ethics, and, while not ignoring the element of belief, found little or no use for the element of worship. The historical development of these three elements in Israel's history is essentially their history everywhere. (Pp. 28-29)

We find here transformed into a dynamic context the triple psychological distinction among individuals leading the higher life that we saw in the first article. Progress in, or increased breadth of, human life is measured by the growth of thought. First occurs worship, the symbolic activities and forms that are the product of equivocal ideas: ceremonies, after all, admit of "several accounts" of their origin. As noted earlier, no univocal relation exists between action and thought. We begin our intellectual history with indistinct ideas symbolized by actions that admit of a variety of interpretations, if, indeed, any conscious attempt is even made to derive their meaning or significance. From this point onward, ideas gain prominence and clarity, the suggestion being that repeated external action may lead to an *in*sight into the idea it manifests. And we conclude not merely with thought but with thought about action, the sages giving "practically all of their thought . . . to ethics." History, then, is the progress of human thought. Since history's meaning rests, as we have seen, upon a conception of the permanence of human mental faculties, of thought in all its forms, it is not surprising that Harper concludes his historical comments by noting that the three-phase development is "essentially their history everywhere." Thus, in character, the history he is writing is universal. Moreover, since its progress is based upon a hierarchy of those same permanent mental faculties, history is not only progressive, it is purposive. In other words, by recognizing one's present phase, he can in some sense suggest the direction of the future, whether his own or his society's. Herein lies the basis for judgments of individuals, institutions, and nations: how fully they strive within their circumstances and given powers to develop responsibly their thought and consequent action.

Although Harper touches on several other interesting issues in the remainder of the argument, including the historical degradations of the religious spirit, the importance of Christ as a model for thought and

action, and the relation of the religious spirit to the university, the limits of this paper require that we turn to this last topic in its much fuller exploration elsewhere. Before leaving this article, however, it is important to note how he has here characterized the three phases of mental activity and of historical development: both are embodied in the notion of Priest, Prophet and Sage.

I have analyzed in some detail two statements in order to reveal the philosophic issues that are embedded in Harper's religious formulations. This analysis is extremely important in Harper's case because his religious terminology sounds foreign to contemporary, possibly more secular, readers; consequently, one may easily hasten through his statements without perceiving the full import that his central ideas carry. For example, nowhere has this been more clearly reflected than in commentary on his educational theory.

What, for Harper, does religion have to do with modern university education? The fullest exposition of this question appears in the Charter Day Address given at the University of California in 1899, entitled "The University and Democracy" and subsequently published in *The Trend in Higher Education*.[20] In this speech he views democracy, the political institutionalization of individualism, as "the highest ideal of human achievement" (p. 1), an ideal he shortly defines as "righteousness" (p. 20). The term "righteousness" conveys the idea of *doing* what is right or just; as such, it is Harper's way of expressing the Platonic principle of political justice, namely, each one doing his proper work. Thus, he is here not reducing politics to a simple-minded religious sectarianism but is reaffirming in religious terms one of the great historic conceptions of how men should live together. This is extraordinarily important to recognize as he turns to education, "the first and foremost policy of democracy" (p. 9).

To answer the central question of his speech — "What relation does the university sustain to democracy?" (p. 4) — Harper turns to a religious metaphor:

> Democracy has been given a mission to the world, and it is of no uncertain character. I wish to show that the university is the prophet of this democracy and, as well, its priest and its philosopher; that, in other words, the university is the Messiah of the democracy, its to-be-expected deliverer. (P. 12)

The university as prophet, priest and sage![21] We have seen this formulation before, when it was the transformation into history of the distinction between belief, worship, and morality, respectively, a distinction which was *itself* a transformation of the distinction between philosophic (includ-

ing science), artistic, and ethical mental faculties. Here we follow the division into education. Although Harper's analysis of these three functions of the university is extraordinarily rich in detail, I intend to follow it only briefly.

In his summary of the university as prophet, he observes:

> In ancient days, the man who interpreted the past, who measured the present, and who foretold the future was called a prophet. The university, I contend, is this prophet of democracy — the agency established by heaven itself to proclaim the principles of democracy. . . . It is the university that fights the battles of democracy, its war-cry being: 'Come, let us reason together.' . . . The university is the prophet who is to hold high the great ideal of democracy, its mission for righteousness; and by repeated formulation of the ideal, by repeated presentations of its claims, make it possible for the people to realize in tangible form the thought which has come up from their deepest heart. (Pp. 19-20)

This conception of interpretive activity is an extension into institutional terms both of his psychological view of the philosophical faculty of intellect and judgment — here summarized as "reason" — and of his historical view of the prophet's activity. The role of reason is here rendered more clear: the explicit, "repeated formulation" of principles, of the meaning of acts which symbolize deeply felt but rationally indistinct ideas, and the "repeated presentations" of those principles in terms comprehensible to particular audiences, this double interpretive activity permits one to express in particular circumstances the universal truths perceived, "to realize in tangible form the thought which has come up from their deepest heart." I would contend that in other writings Harper has a theory of knowledge that explicitly relates principles and facts, the universal and the particular, but the issue is beyond the scope of this essay. For our purposes, we should note primarily that this is his perception of the university's "intellectual" function, one based not on rationality exercised for its own sake but rationality which is in some sense ultimately purposive, that is, directed toward democracy and righteousness.

The priestly function of the university comes next.

> The priest is concerned with the religious cultus or practice, and finds his chief occupation in the upbuilding and preservation of the practice. His work is the work of service. He is the mediator between the individual and the ideal, whether abstract or concrete, which constitutes his God. For the god of each individual is that individual's highest conception of man, his ideal man. The priest of democracy's religion is therefore a mediator between man and man;

> for man is the constituent element in democracy, and humanity is the ideal of all its aspirations. (P. 22)

The priestly function of "mediator between the individual and the ideal" is Harper's transformation of the activities of art and worship, namely, the action symbolic of ideas deeply felt yet not necessarily fully accounted for in rational terms, which is the first stage in the history of an idea, whether in individual, institution, nation, or mankind. The university as priest performs three services: communion, that is, the mediation of the individual's powers and possibilities with his ultimate purpose however indistinctly perceived; consecration, the institutional isolation necessary to pursue its proper activity; and initiation, the training of individuals in already extant modes of thought. He concludes this section by noting that

> the true university, the university of the future, is one the motto of which will be: Service for mankind wherever mankind is, whether within scholastic walls or without those walls and in the world at large. (Pp. 27-28)

The community the university serves, then, is not merely an institution, a region, or even a nation; it is the community of all individuals, of all mankind.

Harper now turns to the question of the university as sage.

> It was not always possible, in the Old Testament economy, to draw a sharp line between the work of the prophet, the priest, and the philosopher or sage. The work of the sage entered into that of both the priest and the prophet; the prophetic ranks were often recruited from those of the priests. But, in spite of some confusion and interchange, there was a marked distinction. The prophet was the idealist; the priest, the formalist; the sage, the humanist. The prophet's thought centered on the nation; the priest's, on the church; the sage's, on the world. From our modern point of view, the prophet might be called the preacher; the priest, the trainer or teacher; the sage, the thinker. (P. 28)

As in the discussion of mental faculties, the distinctions between the three kinds of activities are neither absolute nor exclusive; recognition of one as opposed to another is a question of emphasis in purpose. Nevertheless, though the activities of prophet, priest and sage have much in common, characteristic approaches can still be distinguished. The prophet, as idealist, is concerned with thought, the interpretation of events, the meaning of actions; his scope is national in that the framework of thought, the traditional and linguistic basis of meaning, is a particular culture. The

priest, as formalist, is concerned with the passions, the directing of feelings and choices regarding self and others by means of communion, consecration, and initiation; the scope is institutional ("the church") in that the concern is habituation of an activity within formal channels already extant. Last comes the sage, who, as humanist, is concerned with action, with human activities in their concrete, definite consequences on other humans irrespective of any ambiguity in the interpretation of them; the scope is world-wide in that action has consequences which are independent of meanings attached to them by particular persons or cultures, which flow beyond institutional formalities, and which, therefore, ultimately include all mankind.

Harper characterizes the sage in modern terms as "the thinker." I would suggest that he uses the term here as a pragmatist would: thought as instrumental of action. This is not the thought of the prophet, the investigator reflecting on meaning and interpretation. Rather, it is thought directed at facilitating the actions and purposes of men; and if those actions are to be proper in relation to other men, then the issue here is, in Harper's earlier terms, ethical thought. The function of the sage is to take the thought transiently and indistinctly experienced by men, given stability in symbolic form by repeated activity under the direction of priestly mediation, distinctly formulated as principles of purpose by the interpretation of the prophets — to take that thought and show its practical consequences, indeed, the necessity of implementing that thought in men's daily affairs so that they may act more ethically. And if, in summary, the university as prophet, priest, and sage performs its proper work, democracy's mission of righteousness may be fulfilled.

This review of the structure of Harper's thought is meant to be suggestive, certainly not exhaustive. The foregoing analysis indicates that the observations from Storr and Veysey quoted at the beginning of this paper — that Harper's mind "was not speculative" and that he was "basically untouched by the power of abstract ideas" — need tempering. He was, indeed, a man of action, but it is vital in understanding his actions to recognize that they flowed from a systematically reflective man. Moreover, his University of Chicago appears to me to be more than the attempt, in Gould's words above, "to build an educational 'Trust';" rather, it should be viewed as his attempt to institutionalize an idea, namely, Christian individualism.

Notes

[1] (New York, 1906).

[2] (New York, 1910), pp. 405-41.

[3] *William Rainey Harper: First President of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1928). See Preface for the circumstances of composition.

[4] (Chicago, 1966).

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[6] (New York, 1962), p. 351.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 420 and 492.

[8] (New York, 1953), p. 424.

[9] (New York, 1961), pp. 55-63.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[12] (Chicago, 1965), pp. 397 and 369.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 377.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 368 and 369.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 369.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 372.

[17] *Religion and the Higher Life* (Chicago, 1904). *The Trend in Higher Education* (Chicago, 1905).

[18] I want to thank several individuals at the University of Chicago who generously assisted me by commenting upon earlier drafts of the following comments, namely, Professors Robert L. McCaul, Leonard K. Olson, Harold Wechsler, and Charles Wegener.

[19] *Religion and the Higher Life, op. cit.*, pp. 1-20. Subsequent page references to this book are contained in my main text.

[20] *Op. cit.*, pp. 1-34. Subsequent page references to this article are contained in my main text.

[21] The "philosopher" is really the "sage," as Harper makes clear when he develops the idea on pages 28ff.

Deschooling Revisited: An Examination of Ivan Illich's Social Thought

Timothy Reagan
University of Illinois

I

The central theme of this paper is that if Ivan Illich's educational proposals are examined in the light of his more general social thought,[1] it becomes clear that Illich is offering us neither a radical nor a libertarian alternative to contemporary, institutionalized schooling.[2] Rather, Illich's proposals are supportive of, and grounded in, what is essentially a medieval conception of human society.

The medieval ideal of human society stresses the cooperative nature of human endeavor, coupled with an emphasis on the ties of the individual both to the social community and to nature. The partial dichotomy which emerges here between the individual and the community, incidentally, is based on the medieval acceptance of the independent existence and ontological significance of the individual — a point which will become relevant shortly.

Further, this ideal carries with it a number of other cogent tenets which have major socio-economic, political, and religious implications. Among these are the notion of the dignity of poverty (most clearly exemplified in the medieval view of the mendicant), the concept of legitimate or "just" authority (which, although related to both the notion of the "Great Chain of Being" and that of Divine Right, is not dependent on either), and the conception of the central role to be played by religion (or, more accurately, by religious faith) in both social and individual life.

It is important at this point for us to clearly distinguish and explicate the ways in which this concept differs from contemporary mainstream ideology in the West (i.e., New Liberalism), which has been one of the frequent, if generally unarticulated, targets of Illich's work. While there may, in fact, be some surface similarities, these two conceptions of society are, I would suggest, basically incompatible.

The notion of community is a good example of this theoretical incompatibility. While both the New Liberal society and Illich's ideal stress the cooperative nature of the social community, and while both appear to accept a transcendental view of community, the two conceptions are nonetheless far from parallel. The New Liberal conception views the individual/community dichotomy as a false one, since, it is generally asserted, an individual is socially constituted and, hence, has no meaningful independent existence apart from the community.[3] Further, this

perspective sees the *end* of the community as the maintenance and continuity of the community itself.

Sharing the New Liberal rejection of the individual/community dichotomy to some extent, the medieval conception of the "just society" is less able to make this rejection a universal one. This is so for a number of reasons. First, while arguing that in the ideal the dichotomy between the individual and the community ought to be minimal, this perspective does recognize the unlikelihood of this fortuitous development, and therefore, the need to plan for dissonance which need not be blamed on the individual. This demonstrates a fundamental distinction between the two social ideologies: New Liberalism perceives any conflict between the individual and the community as dysfunctional, and symptomatic of a problem of adjustment in the individual, while the medieval notion sees some conflict as a positive and functional social force (e.g., the role played by saints and, in an earlier age, by the prophets), and also as potentially (though not necessarily) demonstrative of *social*, rather than individual, ills.

Second, the medieval ideal's rejection of the individual/community dichotomy is less total due to its basic acceptance of the notion of independent and free individuality, as noted earlier. While stressing the need for and desirability of social cooperation, this ideal also emphasizes the individual's personal responsibility — for example, for ethical decision-making in accord with Moral Law (especially as manifested in *informed* individual conscience), thus limiting the extent to which the community can legitimately supersede the individual.

Related to this idea of individual responsibility is a notion of the *end* of the community which is very different from that of the New Liberal conception of social ends. The community, as understood in medieval theory, has what Dante, writing at the start of the fourteenth century,[4] referred to as *duo ultima* — two final goals. The first, religious regeneration leading to salvation, is to be achieved through membership in the religious community — but nevertheless on an essentially individual, rather than communal, basis. The second goal is happiness in the present world, which is achieved through the civil community, and which will be more, if not completely, communal in orientation. These *duo ultima* can be reached, it is believed, only together, as two parts of a greater whole. The distinction between the New Liberal and medieval conceptions of social ends, then, is related to the role to be played by the individual in the community, as well as to the issue of whether the community or the individuals which compose the community are the central concern of the just social order.

Although typical of the differences between the medieval and New Liberal conceptions of society, the notion of community is but one of several very good examples which might be presented here. Other possi-

bilities include the role of nature in both individual and social life, the nature, origin, and limitations of legitimate authority, the question of alienation, the nature of and problems with social institutions, the goal of human life, the role of religious faith (both personally and socially), and so on. In each of these cases, I believe that a good argument could be presented to suggest that the two ideological perspectives will result not only in different, but in incompatible, analyses and social policies.

In the next section of this paper, Ivan Illich's treatment of schooling in contemporary society will be examined, and an attempt will be made to relate this treatment to what I believe is the underlying, essentially medieval, social theory in his thinking. It should be noted, as well, that the same sort of analysis would be applicable to Illich's treatment of other components of modern society (such as energy, medicine, and religion).

II

Illich's critique of schooling, like his critiques of other social institutions, is essentially dialectical, first stressing the flaws and problems with the current situation, and second, offering an alternative model of what might be. His insights with respect to problems in contemporary schooling are both acute and profound, and his model of the deschooled society is a creative and intriguing one. What he fails to provide — as do so many other educational critics — is a reasonable description of how, if we so desired, we might get from what is to what ought to be. This problem, which is common to all of Illich's institutional critiques, leaves one with the fear that, as the old Vermont farmer once observed with regard to another problem, "You can't get there from here." This is, however, a problem of a nature quite different from that with which most of this paper will be concerned, and one which is, I think, far more easily resolved than those which might be derived from the analysis which follows.

The dialectical stance which Illich adopts for his critique of schooling can be seen clearly in the distinction he draws between the concept of "schooling" and that of "education." This distinction, which is based on differences in function and consequence, is central to Illich's argument. "Schooling" is a compulsory, age-specific institutional process, carried out by and in schools, for the good of the society (or, more accurately, the good of an elite in the society), and includes such functions as custodial care, sorting and tracking, indoctrination and socialization, and, to a limited extent, education. "Education" refers to an individual process, and is tied up with rather vague notions of the voluntary acquisition by the individual of the common "moral, cultural, and aesthetic values" which together constitute our social capital — the right to which is, for Illich, a "natural" one.[5] The negative side of Illich's dialectic is "schooling," the positive side "education."

It is worthwhile to reiterate and explicate the functions of modern schooling as Illich — quite rightly, I suspect — perceives them. The first function of schooling is that of providing custodial care:

> As much as anything else, schooling implies custodial care for persons who are declared undesirable elsewhere by the simple fact that a school has been built to serve them. The school is supposed to take the excess population from the street, the family or the labor force.[6]

This custodial function of schooling, incidentally, is no less applicable to senior citizens who are encouraged to return to the classroom than it is to ten-year-olds removed from the home, or sixteen-year-olds from the work force.

The second function of schooling is the process of "social-role selection," which takes place as a consequence of the deliberate, planned sorting and tracking which occurs in the school in a variety of ways. This sorting is based, primarily, on what Illich terms the "ideology of merit" — that is, on a belief in the meritocratic ideal. This ideal is reinforced by the school in its role as certifying agency, which ensures the continuity of faith in the efficacy of schooling. This is not to say, of course, that schools, any more than contemporary society as a whole, actually *are* meritocratic. Illich is well aware of the social class, racial, ethnic, sexual and other variables which prevent the development of a true meritocratic order. His critique extends, however, even to the perfect meritocracy:

> A perfect meritocracy, in which there would be no excuses, is not yet upon us, and I believe it can be avoided. It must be avoided, since a perfect meritocracy would not only be hellish, it would be hell.[7]

The third function performed by schooling is the socialization, or indoctrination, of the young into the social order — a social order which Illich sees as fundamentally unjust, based on an acceptance of social conformity, consumerism, and the "ideology of merit" which together perpetuate social ills. This is accomplished, in large part, through the "hidden curriculum" of the school, which one of Illich's supporters has identified as the "main thrust" of his critique of contemporary schooling.[8]

The fourth function of schooling, which only rarely occurs, Illich implies, is education. From his discussion of this aspect of schooling, it is clear that Illich views such a result as happening in spite of, rather than because of schooling. In fact, Illich asserts that "the school has an anti-educational effect on society"[9] as well as on the individual.

A central feature of Illich's paradigm for the examination of social institutions is the *nature* of the institution itself. Institutions, Illich believes, fall along a spectrum, ranging from left to right in terms of the extent to which they are, respectively, "convivial" or "manipulative." The former are the ideal desired by Illich, and are distinguished by spontaneous, voluntary use, though use marked by some degree of regulation. The latter, which Illich argues are the dominant type in modern society, are coercive in nature, tend to be socially and/or psychologically "addictive," are very complex, and entail production processes which result in convincing consumers of their need for the goods or services offered by the institution.[10] Schools, of course, are institutions of the "manipulative" sort: they are compulsory state institutions, they breed in their clientele an ever-expanding desire for more of their services, are incredibly complex, and certainly convince their clients (both successes and failures) of the *need* for the services provided by the school. As will be discussed in detail later, Illich's alternative to this state of affairs is the development of "convivial" institutions to encourage the process of education.

Within the institution of schooling, one of the major components which requires greater examination is the role of the teacher. The teacher in the modern school has, in Illich's view, become an impediment, rather than an aid, to the process of education.[11] This has come about as a result of the triple role the teacher is expected to play: as custodian, moralist, and therapist.[12] As Illich comments,

> Children are protected by neither the First nor the Fifth Amendment when they stand before the secular priest, the teacher. The child must confront a man who wears an invisible triple crown, like the papal tiara, the symbol of triple authority combined in one person. For the child, the teacher pontificates as pastor, prophet, and priest — he is at once guide, teacher, and administrator of a sacred ritual.[13]

Finally, the school as a manipulative institution must be understood to be a universal phenomenon — one no longer grounded in any particular ideology. Illich argues that:

> . . . it does not matter whether the curriculum is designed to teach the principles of Fascism, liberalism, Catholicism, socialism or liberation, as long as the institution claims the authority to define which activities are legitimate 'education.'[14]

Further, in drawing attention to the fact that the ritual of schooling itself constitutes an important aspect of the "hidden curriculum,"[15] Illich notes that,

> In all nations, the educated use the same ritual to seduce and obligate others to accept their faith (in schooling).[16]

An important facet of Illich's attack on contemporary schooling is his critique of the epistemological foundations upon which modern schooling is based. Illich asserts that knowledge has become objectified. As a consequence, schools are seen as factories which produce "knowledge-as-commodity," rather than as aiding the individual to subjectively come to "know." The distinction here is that of *knowledge* and *knowing* — former being a thing which can be possessed, the latter an individual process which cannot be reified.

This distinction is related, I believe, to what Illich calls the "functional shift of institutions."[17] This shift involves the transition from "frameworks of action" to "factories of goods," and can be seen in the linguistic shift which accompanies it. For example, "educating children" has become "giving children an education," just as "housing oneself" has become "buying a house."

Further, the distinction between knowledge and knowing is demonstrated with great clarity in Illich's refusal to allow competence and curriculum (i.e., certification) to be collapsed into a single concept,[18] as is generally the case in modern society.

The preceding discussion constitutes what might be termed the negative side of the dialectic which Illich establishes for his examination of "education" in its conventional, institutional form in contemporary society. The positive side of the dialectic, which Illich calls the "deschooled society," presents us with a very different image of how the process of education might be institutionally undertaken by society.

A number of introductory and reiterative comments about the contrasts between the "schooled" and "deschooled" societies are appropriate here. The ends of each are distinct, if not actually in diametric opposition. The end of the "schooled" society is the *trained* (i.e., indoctrinated) person, while that of the deschooled society is the *educated* human being. In short, the former may be said to *school*, the latter to *educate* — processes which are, I think, quite different.

Futher, these processes are carried out in social institutions of similarly distinct natures. Schools, as conceptualized in modern society, are manipulative institutions, while "learning webs" and educational vouchers are convivial ones.

Finally, as noted earlier, the view of knowledge found in the two sorts of societies is fundamentally incompatible. The "schooled" society in which we live sees knowledge as a good or commodity which is quantitatively disseminated in specific social institutions (schools), and whose differential possession serves to explain and justify social inequities. The

deschooled society, on the other hand, perceives knowledge more in terms of the process of knowing — a notion not amenable to easy quantification. This process of knowing can be facilitated by interaction with others, but is not — and cannot be — distributed in manipulative institutions like so many bowls of watered-down soup.

Illich's conception of the deschooled society, which he believes to have already begun to evolve,[19] entails four interrelated developments. The first of these developments is quite simply the disestablishment of schools. As schools are disestablished, three sets of convivial institutions must be set up. The first of these would be the establishment of a systematic method of providing equal access to whatever educational resources individuals might desire. To perform this function, Illich proposes as a tentative alternative some sort of educational voucher system. The second and third convivial institutions to be established are networks of educational "tools" and people, which will together comprise a virtually unlimited series of "learning webs."

These convivial educational institutions share three core concerns. The first of these concerns is an emphasis on inculcating care for others as individuals, rather than for self or for the transcendental society as a whole.[20] The second is that the central aim of educational institutions must be the provision of "access to reality," which is a step toward a "celebration of awareness."[21] Finally, the third concern is that the right to education is a "natural right" possessed by each individual by virtue of the individual's humanity.

These core concerns are manifested in the criteria which Illich argues must be met by alternatives to contemporary schooling for them to be acceptable. Among these criteria are such considerations as ensuring that education be open to *all* persons in the society, that it be available when people need or desire it, that it avoids institutionalizing (in a manipulative sense) either the subject matter or the pedagogical methodology, and that it rejects a conception of "knowledge-as-commodity." Deschooling, Illich believes, meets all of these criteria.

Illich's critique of contemporary schooling, while both valid and useful, is neither as unique nor as original as is sometimes suggested. The critique is primarily a description of modern industrial-bureaucratic schooling, stressing a variety of problems which were common knowledge long before Illich. As Maxine Greene has noted,

> Presenting not the slightest evidence that he has read the literature of education, Illich picks out the very problems with which educational researchers and philosophers have been concerned for at least fifty years and displays them before our (presumably horrified) eyes. . . . I find it difficult to understand how people who *are* familiar with the literature can react to Illich's reports upon the

schools as if he were bringing the news that God is dead.[22]

While I think that Greene has failed to recognize some important distinctions between Illich's message and the educational research and discussion which preceded him — not the least of which is Illich's successful role in aiding the popularization of both knowledge of and concern about educational problems — I would maintain that it is the critique of contemporary schooling which is the least controversial component of Illich's work. As Steven Tozer has commented,

> It is this description of modern industrial-capitalist structure, incidentally, to which critics of . . . Illich have the least objection.[23]

It is, rather, with his description of the deschooled society that Illich presents a creative and distinctive alternative to that which precedes his arrival on the pedagogic scene. And, it is in his conception of the deschooled society that Illich's essentially medieval social theory is manifested. Illich's deschooled society is, in short, basically a description of education as it emerges in medieval social thought.

Central to an adequate understanding of the concept of deschooling is the nature of the convivial institution. Illich emphasizes that one of the central features of such an institution is to encourage the development in each person of a concern for others as individuals, rather than being either egocentric or poliscentric (where the *polis*, or community, is viewed as a whole rather than as a grouping of individual parts). This concern is quite like that of the medieval conception of the "good community," in which the biblical injunction to "love thy neighbor as thyself" is effected. It is just such a community that is posited by St. Thomas Aquinas in Chapter 13 of *On the Perfection of the Spiritual Life*.[24]

A second feature of the convivial institution is that it provides "access to reality" which plays a role in the development of the "celebration of awareness." Both of these ideas are grounded in what is a predominantly theocentric view of the world. The former entails a rejection of the current relativistic conception of social reality — as exhibited in such movements as the rise of situational ethics, the shift in philosophy of science from the positivism of Popper to the near-anarchism of Feyerabend, the increasingly common "suit yourself" brand of individualism, and so forth. The latter idea, most clearly enunciated in Illich's "A Call to Celebration,"[25] is centered on the desirability of "living change" rather than on relying on planned or engineered illusions. Ultimately, this ideal is a religious one, aimed at increasing — through both social and spiritual activity — mankind's humanity, dignity, and "joyfulness."[26]

Finally, the reliance of Illich's defense of the convivial institution on the notion of innate "natural rights" is an interesting one. It appears to me that this concept, in Illich's case, is embedded in an acceptance of the

lex naturalis — not, as one might suppose, in the conception of natural rights which emerged in the period of the Enlightenment. The distinction between these two perspectives is an important one: the former presupposes a metaphysical foundation for the law, while the latter is a rational, essentially non-theistic construct.[27]

Illich's description of "learning webs," which play a major role in his conception of the deschooled society, calls manorial life to mind. On first reading, of course, Illich sounds considerably more egalitarian than would make such a connection reasonable. However, it is important to bear in mind that Illich *does* posit an authority structure, recognizes the need for both social rules and individual discipline, and does *not* call for any sort of egalitarian revolution. Further, Illich is consistently vague on all of these issues. I tend to agree with Neil Postman, when he argues that,

> . . . Illich is not only a mystic and a utopian but an authoritarian as well. . . . Illich's eye is firmly fixed on the goal, which fixation is the essence of authoritarianism.[28]

One is further reminded of medieval society on a number of other points. Illich's rejection of certification in favor of competence is clearly much more compatible with medieval conceptions of society than with modern ones. So, indeed, is his conception of knowledge, his non-age-specific educational schema,[29] and his non-compulsory conception of social order. Last, running consistently throughout Illich's writing, both on education and on other issues, is a view of poverty which is quite alien to the modern world, and just as feasible in the medieval. Illich sees poverty as granting a special sort of dignity, and potentially offering a conception of social reality which could be envied by those in more prosperous settings.[30]

In the thirteenth century, Iacopone da Todi wrote:

> He that has poverty for Love
> Has for dominion peace . . .
>
> High Wisdom is in Poverty,
> For nothing holds her thrall. . . .
>
> A mystic heaven is Poverty,
> To earth-dim eyes concealed . . .
>
> That man is poor who, having naught,
> From will to have is free . . .[31]

Ivan Illich would, I think, agree with such sentiments.

Notes

[1] For a description of Illich's general social theory within the framework suggested here, see Timothy Reagan, "The Foundations of Ivan Illich's Social Theory," in *Educational Theory* (forthcoming).

[2] Illich has been described as a libertarian, a revolutionary, a radical, a participatory socialist, a supporter of entrepreneurial capitalism, and probably everything in between. For examples of this broad range of perceptions, see Robin Barrow, *Radical Education* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978); Herbert Gintis, "Toward a Political Economy of Education: A Radical Critique of Ivan Illich's *Deschooling Society*," in Ivan Illich et al., *After Deschooling, What?* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973); Carl G. Hedman, "The 'Deschooling' Controversy Revisited: A Defense of Illich's 'Participatory Socialism'," *Educational Theory* 29, 2(Spring 1979); Hugh G. Petrie, "Review of Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society*," *Educational Theory* 22, 4(Fall 1972); Joaquin Saenz y Arriaga, *Cuernavaca y el progresimo religioso en México* (México: 1967); and Madan Sarup, *Marxism and Education* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978).

[3] This is, of course, a grossly over-simplified analysis of New Liberal thought. I do not mean to suggest that New Liberalism is entirely consistent internally, nor that all of its manifestations will totally ignore the separate existence of the individual. I do think, however, that a reasonably valid case might be made (emphasizing George Herbert Mead, for example) which would support the general contention that the individual/community dichotomy is, for New Liberalism, a problematic one. I do not believe that the shoddy attempts at recreating a front of "rugged individualism" on television, in films, and so on, constitute a refutation of this claim. In fact, given time and space, I believe that these could actually be shown to be just the reverse of what they initially appear to be.

Another approach to this issue is to stress the difference between the articulation and the effects of an ideology. In the case of New Liberalism, I suspect that it could be shown that these two concepts are, despite some apparent inconsistencies, fundamentally in accord on most issues, and that if the rhetoric of ideological articulation is carefully examined, rather than simply taken at face value, it can in fact be shown to support a variety of very undesirable (and, I think, immoral) social developments.

[4] See Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Vol. 1, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 17.

[5] Michael Macklin, *When Schools are Gone: A Projection of the Thought of Ivan Illich* (St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1976), p. 46.

[6] Ivan Illich, "The Futility of Schooling in Latin America," *Saturday Review* 51 (20 April 1968): 58, quoted in Macklin, p. 25.

[7] Ivan Illich, *Celebration of Awareness* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969), p. 182.

[8] Macklin, p. 25.

[9] Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970), p. 11.

[10] See Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society*, Chapter 4.

[11] Ivan Illich, "Critica a la liturgia de la enseñanza," in Paulo Friere et al., *Educación para el cambio social* (Buenos Aires: Tierra Nueva, 1974+), p. 103.

[12] Illich, *Deschooling Society*, pp. 44-6.

[13] Ibid., p. 46.

[14] Ivan Illich, *The Alternative to Schooling*, p. 3, quoted in Macklin, p. 27.

[15] Illich, *Deschooling Society*, p. 48.

[16] Illich, "Critica a la liturgia de la enseñanza," p. 102. (My translation.)

[17] Ivan Illich and Etienne Verne, *Imprisoned in the Global Classroom* (London: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative, 1976), p. 27.

[18] Illich, *Deschooling Society*, p. 17.

[19] Illich and Verne, pp. 15-6.

[20] Macklin, pp. 55-6.

[21] See Illich, "A Call to Celebration," in *Celebration of Awareness*, pp. 13-8.

[22] Maxine Greene, "And It Still Is News," in Ivan Illich et al., *After Deschooling, What?*, p. 129.

[23] Steven Tozer, "Deschooling: An Introduction to the Issues," unpublished essay, 1978, p. 2.

[24] See Vernon J. Bourke (ed.), *The Pocket Aquinas* (New York: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1960), pp. 258-9.

[25] Illich, *Celebration of Awareness*, pp. 13-8.

[26] Ibid., p. 15.

[27] See A.P. d'Entrèves, *Natural Law* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1970), Chapters 3 and 4.

[28] Neil Postman, "My Illich Problem," in Illich et al., *After Deschooling, What?*, pp. 143-4.

[9] Philippe Aries' masterful work, *Centuries of Childhood* (New York: Random House, 1962), comes to mind here.

[10] Illich, *Celebration of Awareness*, p. 173. See also Illich and Verne, pp. 20-1; and Illich, "Crítica a la liturgia enseñanza," p. 114.

[11] Quoted in Walter Shewring, *Rich and Poor in Christian Tradition* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1948), pp. 145-150.

John Lancaster Spalding: The Horace Mann of Catholic Education

Robert Newton Barger
Eastern Illinois University

Introduction

John Lancaster Spalding has strangely been forgotten for his work in education. William Torrey Harris once called him "the most beloved of American educators."[1] Nicholas Murray Butler, on becoming president of Columbia, saw to it that Spalding received one of the first honorary doctorates given during Butler's administration. Merle Curti included a chapter on Spalding in his classic book *The Social Ideas of American Educators*. What were Spalding's educational accomplishments which merited such encomiums from these leading secular educators?

It will be the task of this paper to trace Spalding's work in the field of education and to explicate his role as a builder of the American Catholic educational system. It is the thesis of this paper that, though he as been forgotten, Spalding's contributions to Catholic education could well be paralleled with the contributions of Horace Mann to public education.

Spalding and Parochial Schools

Spalding set out his views on parochial schools very early and stuck to them throughout his life. In 1871, while still a young priest, he contributed an editorial to the Louisville *Catholic Advocate* in which he claimed that religion was dying out because of the influence of the common schools. These schools, he felt, led to indifference on the part of the students since no religion was imparted within them and the idea was fostered there that one religion was as good as another. It was an injustice, Spalding wrote, for Catholics to be taxed for these schools which they could not in conscience use. Political agitation to gain money from the state for Catholic schools might bring about more evil than good, however. Spalding was afraid that such agitation would distract Catholics from spiritual concerns and involve them in political issues. "This could not result favorably to the cause of Catholicism," he said.[2]

Spalding commented further in the editorial that, "The bishops of the United States have in nothing shown greater wisdom than in their persistent efforts to afford opportunities of religious education to the children of the church and thus effectually to prevent them from frequenting the common schools."[3] Spalding pointed to the growing number of Catholics in the United States and said that more schools were needed, in spite

of the fact that already extant Catholic schools, "it is true, are not always what we might desire them to be."[4]

Children who were not taught the doctrines and laws of the Church in school usually failed to learn them anywhere, Spalding said. He also said that if they did not attend a Catholic school they frequently would not go to catechism class on Sunday, or even receive the sacraments of the Church. But his major fear was that they would grow religiously indifferent. This tendency, he thought, was one which the common schools "of necessity help to promulgate . . . and hence the common schools, instead of being unsectarian, are simply anti-Catholic."[5]

In subsequent writings, Spalding suggested that what was most needed in the American Catholic Church of his day was organization. Anticipating the decrees of the Third Plenary Council in 1884, he felt that every parish must have its own school and that "some system of grades, examinations, and superintendence of diocesan boards must be introduced into our schools. Standards and tests of qualification in the teachers, whether secular or religious, should also be fixed by some central authority, so that it shall no longer depend upon accident whether the school is Catholic except in name."[6] Spalding was not in favor of having parochial schools at the expense of quality, however. He said: "No school is, in any true sense, a religious school, if the teaching is inferior and the discipline poor: for the inevitable result of such teaching is intellectual, moral and religious deterioration."[7]

Spalding had expressed a hope as early as 1877, "that the time is not very remote when in this country Catholic children will be brought up only in Catholic schools."[8] In 1881 he wrote a pastoral letter to the priests of his diocese, saying,

> A Catholic congregation without a Catholic school is like a family without a mother. The Sunday School can at best perform the office of a stepmother. . . . If therefore, Reverend and Dear Sir, your congregation is without a school do not rest until one has been provided. Upon this point, it seems to me it is not possible to be insistent out of season. We need but look at the congregations which are maintaining Catholic schools in order to perceive at a glance that very many others are deprived of this most effective means of preserving and strengthening the faith, not from want of ability, but from lack of will. . . . Indifference to education is want of faith.[9]

Under Spalding's administration, the church-to-school ratio in his diocese of Peoria rose from 16 percent to 33 percent between 1877 and 1908, while the U.S. ratio dropped from 38 percent to 36 percent during the same period. In the pupil-to-Catholic population ratio, the Peoria Diocese has also come from behind. In the year of Spalding's retirement,

the Peoria Diocese had a higher percentage of Catholics in parochial schools than did most U.S. dioceses.

Spalding felt that parents were the natural educators of their children and any system of education which weakened their control over their children, as Spalding thought the common school system did, was bad. He also felt that a state which tolerates different religions was debarred from establishing a school system. If the system simply ignored religion, it would do "violence to the consciences of all sincere and thoughtful believers."[10] It could not accept commonly held beliefs, since the modern state had no common beliefs, being composed of atheists as well as Christians. But even if there were common beliefs, they would not be held in common but would rather be integral parts of distinct dogmatic systems. Spalding concluded that the only fair thing for a government to do, if it were going to enter into the school business at all, was to establish a denominational system of education. In 1882 he still felt that "The practical difficulties to be overcome are not insuperable" as far as switching to a denominational system was concerned. Twenty years later he would comment with unhappy resignation that,

> The State has taken control of education, and is thereby weakening one of the most essential and vital forces — the sense of responsibility in parents. It has, in consequence, been led to exclude religious instruction from the process of education; has, indeed, abandoned the work of education, and contended itself with some sort of mental training which sharpens the intellect but leaves the moral nature untouched and unraised. As a result, the young lose reverence, lose the power of discerning what is high and noble, and are only a more enlightened sort of barbarians. Had the State confined itself to encouraging and assisting the religious denominations to found and maintain the schools, and to giving aid to private educational enterprises, it would have acted in harmony with our theory of government, and we should be today a worthier, more religious and not less enlightened people; while, from an economic point of view, education would have been made vastly cheaper."[11]

Spalding favored an educational atmosphere which he thought was conducive to the formation of the whole man. This he conceived to be one "in which learning blends with piety, knowledge with faith, true thought with chaste life, love with obedience."[12] He found it strange that the influences of civil religion should be allowed in the school, but not those of supernatural religion. As he put it: "Shall we in our schools set aside days to commemorate some mediocre patriot, poet, or orator, and make it an offense there to do homage to Him who has given His name to our civilization. . . ?"[13]

On occasion, however, Spalding could temper his criticism of public

education. In an 1894 article in the *North American Review*, he said:

> For my own part — and I think I express the Catholic view — I not only would not, had I the power, destroy the public school system, but would leave nothing undone to develop and perfect it. I believe in free schools, in universal education, and, wherever public opinion is sufficiently enlightened, in compulsory school attendance. The objections which the bishops of Wisconsin and Illinois urged against the Bennett Law and the Edwards Law were based upon the fact that these laws were an infringement upon the principle of freedom in matters of education. If here and there individuals have made efforts to get public moneys [sic] for parochial schools, the Catholic body is not to be held responsible for their acts.[14]

The Edwards Law of which Spalding spoke was a compulsory education law passed by the Illinois General Assembly in 1889. The provisions in the law which Catholics, and also Lutherans, found objectionable were the stipulations that parochial schools were to be subjected to approval by public school boards and that instruction in the basic subjects was to be given in English. What was at issue, in view of the Catholics and Lutherans, was not simply a question of language or length of attendance but the more basic question of the control of education. To the Catholics and Lutherans, the Edwards Law clearly seemed to vest too much control in the state.

Spalding authored a pastoral letter on this subject addressed to the Catholics of Illinois. It was signed by all of the Catholic bishops of the state.

> In our practical acceptance of the principles that Education is essentially religious; that without it, however much the mind and body may be trained, man cannot be rightly educated, we take the true and deep view of this all-important subject; and the influence of our schools will come to be a potent moral and intellectual influence in America.
>
> We urge you therefore, dear Brethren, to cherish the cause of Christian education as the cause of God and our country. In building, maintaining and perfecting our Catholic schools we are doing the most beneficient work American citizens can do; a work which, like true piety, is useful both for the life that now is, and for that which is to come. . . . When we consider what we have done and are doing to educate our Catholic children, while we also contribute to the support of the public schools, it seems inexplicable to us that the Legislature of Illinois should have enacted what is known as the Edwards Law; an insidious and unjust law, which, under pretext of zeal for popular education is really a violation of our most sacred

rights, as men and citizens. Freedom of worship implies and involves freedom of education. If the state may dictate to us what kind of school we shall have, it may make it a penal offense not to frequent the church it may select. *We denounce this law as a violation of our constitutional rights, and hold that those who favor it are unworthy of the support of enlightened and fair minded voters. Let us use all right and honorable means to have it repealed,* and let the designing and bigoted be taught that the WEST is not a field in which their labors will bear fruit.[15]

Clearly, the pastoral was at pains to establish a socially acceptable non-sectarian defense upon which to base its counsel that the Catholics of Illinois should "turn the rascals out."

In the 1892 election, a coalition of Catholic and German Lutheran voters did sweep the Republicans out of office in Illinois. Post-election analysis suggested that the Edwards Law issue had been a crucial factor in the Republican defeat.[16]

In the Edwards Law controversy, Spalding had fashioned a defense of parochial education which was based on constitutional, rather than doctrinal, grounds. This defense, while non-sectarian in character, advocated the option of a religiously based education and an allowance for cultural pluralism. Both of these, Spalding felt, would serve the best interests of a well-formed citizenry, non-Catholic as well as Catholic.

Spalding clung tenaciously to the ideal of parochial schools because of his early and enduring belief that "he who will do most to form the character of the Catholic youth of America, will also have done most to mold the future of the American people."[17] Spalding's seemingly parochial mission was simply part of his role as a social emissary between the Church and American society. What was good for the Church, in his mind, was good for America. "It [the parochial system] is the only elementary education in the United States which holds to the traditional belief that the morals of a people can be rightly nourished and sustained only by religious faith. . . . We believe that religion is the essential element of human life, and therefore of human education."[18] Thus, Spalding, in laboring for and rationalizing an American parochial system of education, saw himself as dedicated to a task of benefit not only to the Church, but also to the State.

Spalding and the Catholic Educational Exhibit

While the American Catholic Church was dealing with the question of parochial schools, a related event of national significance was taking place. This was the Catholic Educational Exhibit at the Chicago World's Fair, or Columbian Exposition, of 1893.[19]

Planning for the event started in 1890 when the United States' bishops decided to take part in the Exposition by way of an educational exhibit. Spalding was chosen by the bishops as the president of the project and Maurelian Schell, a member of the Brothers of the Christian Schools and president of Christian Brothers College, Memphis, Tennessee, was appointed as secretary and general manager.[20]

A conference was called of superiors of religious teaching orders, rectors of seminaries, presidents of colleges and other leading Catholic educators. They agreed that the Exhibit would be a worthwhile venture and agreed to cooperate.[21]

For some unknown reason, Spalding resigned from his post as President of the Exhibit in November 1881.[22] But the American archbishops requested him to recall his resignation and "to bring to a conclusion the work so well begun."[23] This he did. Perhaps he had been discouraged by the state of the parochial school controversy. When he wrote a promotional article on the Exhibit in July 1892 entitled "The Catholic Educational Exhibit in the Columbian Exposition," he footnoted the title with a disclaimer that the article was related in any way to "recent controversies."[24] However, the article was in fact heavily freighted with arguments for the parochial school system and against the kind of accommodation with the public schools which had been proposed by Archbishop John Ireland. A sampling of the kind of argumentation found in the first half of the article is seen in Spalding's claim that "our school system is an organic part of our ecclesiastical constitution. It rests upon principles as wide as human nature, as immortal as Truth. We cannot if we would, we would not if we could, recede from the stand we have taken."[25]

Spalding spoke more directly to the aims of the Exhibit in the remainder of the article. It was, he felt, an unparalleled opportunity to lay before the American people and the world the work which the Catholic schools had been doing.[26] The Exhibit was also expected to provide opportunity for communication between teachers on methods and pedagogical ideas. Encouraging this kind of exchange, Spalding said: "We may easily become victims of the fallacy that a school is Catholic because this adjective is affixed to its name, or because in it prayers are said and catechism is taught. A poor school cannot exert a wholesome influence of any kind. Idle, inattentive, listless, and unpunctual children will not become religious however much they are made to pray and recite catechism. In a truly religious character self-respect, truthfulness, a love of thoroughness and excellence, a disinterested ambition, are as important as a devotional spirit."[27]

Spalding, continuing the enumeration of the Exhibit's aims, said that it was hoped that the Exhibit would "awaken new zeal, arouse a more

generous spirit of sacrifice, and inspire a deeper enthusiasm, in the cause of Christian Education, which is the cause of our country and our religion."[28] Spalding also had hopes that the Exhibit would result in the formation of Catholic counterparts to the National Education Association and the state teacher associations. Further, he hoped that the Exhibit would lead to an increased role of the laity in educational affairs. He said that "education is precisely the field in which Catholic laymen can most readily and most effectively bring their zeal and knowledge to bear upon the living issues and interests of the church."[29] Finally, Spalding thought it probable that the Exhibit and gathering of Catholic teachers would lead to the founding of a Catholic educational magazine. The magazine, as Spalding envisioned it, would run "a series of articles on the history of education, on the great teachers and educational reformers, on pedagogics as a science and as an art; on educational methods; on the bearing of psychology upon questions of education; on hygiene in its relations to the health of teachers and pupils; on the educational values of the various branches of knowledge; on personal influence as a factor in education; [and] on the best means of forming a true religious character."[30]

The Exhibit consisted of displays by 20 dioceses, 17 religious teaching orders and a number of colleges and universities. The displays were composed of the work of students together with curricular materials such as textbooks. A large amount of the students' work was in the form of art, wood carvings and needlepoint. Spalding said during a speech at the Exhibit, "there seems to be an idea abroad that our religion is the absorbing subject taught in our schools. The grand collection is the brightest and most emphatically concrete contradiction of this error. That we do not neglect the culture of the mind, or the training of the hand, is abundantly proved by all that surrounds you."[31]

After the Exhibit was concluded, Brother Maurelian published a report which included a covering letter from Spalding. In this letter Spalding affirmed that "the ends for which the Exhibit was made have been attained. . . . Not to know our educational work, our system and methods, is henceforth inexcusable. No one now, who respects himself, will affirm that our parish schools are inferior to the public schools, or that our teachers in appealing to the heart, the conscience and the imagination, lose sight of the importance of quickening and training the mental faculties."[32] Peter Muldoon, in 1893 a priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago and later Bishop of Rockford, wrote that the Exhibit "advanced among Catholics at one bold stroke the cause of Catholic education a quarter of a century and among non-Catholics it undoubtedly dissipated prejudices that in the usual flow of events would not have been obliterated in fifty years."[33]

Spalding used his involvement with the Catholic Educational Exhibit to defuse the fears of the American public about the Catholic schools, and

to strengthen the system of parochial schools and the commitment of Catholics to them. In these efforts, Spalding believed that he was working not only for the service of the Church but also for that of the State.

Spalding and the Baltimore Catechism

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which met in 1884, decided that a standard catechism was needed for use throughout the country. Before that time there was no really good catechism, let alone one that was uniformly used in the United States. Therefore the Council commissioned a committee of bishops to attend to the matter. Spalding, who had edited a series of Catholic readers a decade earlier, was one of those named to the committee.[34]

One of the bishops on the committee asked Monsignor Januarius De Concilio, the pastor of a Jersey City parish and a noted Catholic scholar, to draft a copy of the proposed catechism to be issued by the Council. De Concilio agreed to do this, but actually just threw something together without spending much time on it because he felt that "the bishops would dump it in the wastebasket anyhow."[35] He was later shocked to see his hastily prepared document turn up in galley proof at the Council.[36] He asked for time to revise it, but his request was refused.

The Council was concluded before the bishops had a chance to suggest their own revisions, so they were instructed to send their suggestions to Spalding who would make the revisions and see the catechism through the printing process. Thomas McMillan, C.S.P., who was himself the editor of a catechism, reported that "from the termination of the Council in early December, 1884, until at least as late as 25 January, 1885, Bishop Spalding remained in New York City as the guest of the Paulist Fathers. . . . During this period the Bishop and Mons. De Concilio worked upon the catechism."[37] Father Francis O'Reilly, who acted as Spalding's chancellor for the Diocese of Peoria, reported that "Butler's [Irish] Catechism was bent to suit United States needs, [and that] Bishop Spalding did most of the work."[38]

The Baltimore Catechism, which was not originally intended as a textbook, became one. In fact, it became the classic means of instruction in the Catholic faith, both in and out of Catholic schools, and continued to hold that position through the first half of the present century. Spalding had a large role in its production and could be considered its author as much as anyone could. In fact, a Franciscan priest who had served in the Diocese of Peoria later reminisced: "All of us were interested in catechetical teaching since His Lordship [Spalding] was an outstanding educator and the author of the Baltimore Catechism."[39]

Spalding Institute

Parallel with the work of the National Education Association's Committee of Ten in 1892 on the standardization of the high school curriculum, there was a movement in Catholic circles to fix a structure for secondary education. The Catholic academy and secondary college had done yeoman service in the past, but their clientele had been rather elite. At the end of the century there was a feeling that the benefits of religious training should be more diffused at the secondary level, as was already being done through parochial education at the elementary level.

Between the end of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884 and 1900, some parish schools attempted to add one or more high school years to their curriculum to fill this need. Many of these elementary-secondary parish schools were shortlived because of lack of adequate financial support. Catholic leaders began to realize the need of separate centralized high schools for Catholics by the turn of the century.

Spalding began plans in 1898 for what was to be one of the first central Catholic high schools in the United States. As he wrote to Father Daniel Hudson at Notre Dame on August 26, 1898, "Your letter found me in the midst of all sorts of work connected with my college for boys here in Peoria, and I have just finished signing contracts today. The whole thing will cost me sixty thousand dollars, but the school I am convinced will do much good."[40] Specifications for the school indicated that it was to have seven class rooms, one manual training room, three recitation rooms, a main hall, a library and a lecture room.[41] The school was to be located a few blocks from the cathedral and within easy walking distance of the trolley lines.

Money for the building of the school was contributed by the priests of the city and the local Knights of Columbus chapter. Spalding himself donated all the royalties from his numerous books toward the project. He was spoken of in the school's early publications as "the founder" and he remained president of the school until his successor, Bishop Edmund Dunne, arrived in Peoria in 1909.[42]

The name Spalding had chosen for the school was "St. Mary's Academy," but the priests of the diocese wished to have it named for Spalding himself. He strenuously objected to this and a compromise of sorts was reached with the name of "Spalding Institute" . . . in honor of his uncle, Martin Spalding, the late archbishop of Baltimore.[43]

Another of Spalding's concerns, besides construction and finance, was the provision of a teaching corps for the school. He was well acquainted with the Christian Brothers through his work with Brother Maurelian at the Catholic Educational Exhibit a few years earlier and he at first turned to this community for teachers. Yet on November 4, 1898, he wrote to Hudson: "I am very much concerned at present about the Christian Brothers. A decision from Rome forbids them to teach the classics. This

is a severe blow at our educational interests."[44] In the end, Spalding decided against the Christian Brothers and obtained instead three members of the Society of Mary, or the Brothers of Mary, as they were called. This community had no such strictures imposed concerning the teaching of the classics.

Spalding is said to have not interfered in the administration of the Institute, but his interest in the school never relaxed.[45] He gave an address entitled "Opportunity" at the opening of the Institute on December 6, 1899, and returned regularly once or twice a month to speak to the students. He attended all of the functions connected with the school. Until 1913 he managed to come to the annual alumni banquet which was given in his honor.[46]

In his role as founder and president of Spalding Institute, Spalding showed himself to be a practical educator. But, his connection with the Spalding Institute was more than that between a school and a "brick and mortar" bishop. As one of the first central Catholic high schools in the United States, Spalding clearly intended his Institute to be a model pointing the way toward systemization of Catholic secondary education.[47]

Spalding and The Catholic University of America

Spalding was as major a contributor to the field of Catholic higher education as he was to the fields of elementary and secondary education. Spalding's vision of the need for an American Catholic university was focused early. He wrote in the *Catholic Advocate* in 1871, in an editorial entitled "The Great Want of the Church in this Country," that there was in the Church in the United States, "a deplorable dearth of intellectual men."[48] He continued that he wished to call attention to "what we consider the chief defect in Catholic education in this country." That defect, he said simply, was that "we have no university — no central seat of learning encircled by the halo of great names, to which the eyes of Catholics from every part of the land might turn with pride and reverence. The passion for learning and literary excellence, like the other passions, grows by contact with that which stimulates it."[49] Spalding acknowledged that there were, indeed, in the United States certain rudimentary Greek and Latin grammar schools kept by the Jesuits and others, "which in sheer mockery of the name, are called universities." But, Spalding felt, "If a young man, upon leaving one of these institutions, has sufficient education to enable him to construe words grammatically, we must be satisfied."[50]

Spalding said that candidates for the priesthood "who have more than ordinary talent" might be sent to Europe to study, but he noted that there were serious objections to educating priests for this country in the schools of Europe. There would be no obstacle, he thought, to the founding of a

Catholic University in America similar to that of Dublin or Louvain. There was perfect freedom here and sufficient wealth and, he said, "we feel confident that the laity would eagerly engage in an enterprise, in which they have such great interests, both as Catholics and American citizens."[51]

Spalding was not the first to conceive of the possibility of an American Catholic university. He had noted in the biography of his uncle that Martin Spalding had proposed such a project at the time of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866, but that the time had not then been thought to be ripe for such an undertaking.[52]

Spalding wrote in his *The Religious Mission of the Irish People* in 1880 that "A system of education which does not receive as its crown a true and real university is not only incomplete, but deprived of its surest defense and the masterlight which should shine upon the steps of those who tread the humbler paths of knowledge."[53] He continued that such a university would not grow up of itself as had the medieval universities. Rather, he felt, it must be created with deliberate and conscious purpose.[54]

After several years of lobbying with his fellow bishops for the start of a university, Spalding was invited to preach at the Third Plenary Council in 1884. When this sermon was later published, Spalding candidly put a footnote on the title explaining that it was "A discourse pronounced at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which, being enforced by the offer of three hundred thousand dollars by Miss Caldwell, led to the founding of the University at Washington."[55] Spalding took occasion during the course of the sermon to enumerate the aims of the proposed university for the assembled American bishops. He saw it as a place where focus could be given to "the living controversies of the age," where a basis might be formed for a Catholic contribution to American literature and where the bishops might unify their scattered forces and random work.[56] Spalding continued his description of the purposes of the Catholic University by giving a litany of losses if the institution were not to come into existence. He said that

> without this the noblest souls will look in vain for something larger and broader than a local charity to make appeal to their generous hearts; without this we shall be able to offer but feeble resistance to the false theories and systems of education which deny to the Church a place in the school; without this the sons of wealthy Catholics will, in ever increasing numbers, be sent to institutions where their faith is undermined; without this we shall vainly hope for such treatment of religious questions and their relations to the issues and needs of the day, as shall arrest public attention and induce Catholics themselves to take at least some little notice of the writings of Catholics; without this in struggles for reform and contests for rights we shall lack the

wisdom of best counsel and the courage which skillful leaders inspire.[57]

Spalding made it clear in his sermon that he held no brief against the existing seminary education. He agreed that this kind of professional school was necessary for preparation in the practical work of the priesthood. He was calling for something over and above this, however, saying that "the education of which I speak does not directly aim at being useful." However, although this type of education did not have a utilitarian aim, "it is in fact the most useful, and prepares better than any other for the business of life."[58]

Characteristically, Spalding, as a social emissary, did not pass up the opportunity to make note of the possible civic contribution of the Catholic University. In words warm with endorsement of America, Spalding said: "since we believe that the Church which points to heaven is able also to lead the nations in the way of civilization and of progress, why should we not desire to see her become a beneficient and ennobling influence in the public life of our country? She can have no higher temporal mission than to be the friend of this great republic, which is God's best earthly gift to His children."[59]

Cardinal James Gibbons appointed a committee of bishops to carry through the plans for the Catholic University and Spalding was one of its members. The committee met frequently during 1885, handling the practical matters of getting the University started. Mary Gwendolyn Caldwell had attached some conditions to her gift. Chief among them was that she was to be known as the founder of the University, that no site was to be selected without her approval and that the University would never be placed in the care of any particular religious teaching community. During the stages of planning, the committee's negotiations with Miss Caldwell were usually carried on through Spalding.[60]

The committee first considered locating the University at Seton Hall College in New Jersey, but it finally decided on a previously unused site near the city of Washington, D.C. Spalding was influential in the choice. He pointed out to the committee that "Washington is neither a Northern nor Southern city, but common ground on which we can all meet to establish a national institution."[61] During 1885 the committee considered such things as building costs, endowment of chairs and fund raising. In regard to the last point, four bishops were appointed to collect money for the University in the various American dioceses. Spalding was one of them.[62]

The University was incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia on April 19, 1887, after it had been approved in a letter of Pope Leo XIII to the American bishops.[63] Spalding gave the address at the laying of the cornerstone on May 24, 1888, for the original university

building, Caldwell Hall. President Grover Cleveland and some of his cabinet were on hand for the occasion. Spalding spoke in praise of democracy and the value of a university.[64]

On March 7, 1889, an apostolic letter of Leo XIII formally approved the statutes of the University and granted it special status as a papally approved university — the first such university of its kind in the United States.[65]

Spalding refused the rectorship of the University, but did serve as a very active member of its Board of Trustees for almost 20 years.

He resigned from the Board in 1907.[66] He had not regained his health since suffering a stroke in 1905, and he was under continuing pressure to step down because of a scandal involving himself and Mary Gwendolyn Caldwell, which had begun to cause problems for him as early as 1902. Although the stipulation of Miss Caldwell's endowment of the university was that she was to be known as the founder, later ages recognize Spalding as having the more basic claim to that title.[67]

Spalding and Normal Education

Spalding was not only concerned with establishing a system of parochial schools, central high schools, and a Catholic University, he also wanted normal schools for Catholics. He wrote an article in *The Catholic World* of April 1890, which was entitled "Normal Schools for Catholics." In the article, he pointed out that a hundred years previously it was accepted that to know a thing was to know how to teach it, but that in 1890 it was plain that knowledge is not necessarily skill. Noting the progress in the study of pedagogics, he hoped that "the day is near when it will be considered criminal to entrust children to those who are ignorant of the science and art of education."[68] Spalding thought that the teacher should have special training, just like other professionals such as priests and physicians. Therefore, he thought that "the Normal School is as essential to a system of education as is the elementary school, or the college, or the university."[69]

Spalding stated that the primary consideration in education was not the quantity of schools but their quality. He pointed to the teaching of religion as an area that was open to criticism as to its quality. On this subject, Spalding, the author of the Baltimore Catechism, said:

> The child learns by heart a multitude of definitions, which it is impossible he should understand, and because he can answer every question in the catechism easily persuades himself that he knows his religion. But since the notions he has acquired are to him almost wholly meaningless, they cannot become a part of his mental growth, and are too often soon lost even to memory; and thus, it

> seems to me, the germs of religious indifference and unintelligence are implanted. It is nearly always fatal to imagine that we know a thing, for what is known loses power to interest; but to imagine that to be able to repeat phrases whose words are unintelligible to us is knowledge, is not merely a delusion but a sort of mental perversion. To know by heart is not to know at all, and this is one of the first lessons the child should be taught.[70]

If the best men and women were to devote themselves to teaching, Spalding felt that the problem of education would be solved. He thought that "an ideal social state" would make that possible, but he realized that, in his present world, special means would have to be provided to train teachers who were less than perfect.[71]

Spalding was of the opinion that no amount of learning would, by itself, make a good teacher: "A great mind, even, like Hegel's, for instance, may fail in the lecture room, and yet be capable of exercising an influence upon the thought of mankind. If such a mind may lack the requisites of a good teacher, what are we to think of those who have neither learning nor special training?"[72] Spalding also realized that the infinite varieties of human endowments indicated that "the education of any human being is a problem for the solution of which there can be no fixed rules; but the chances of success," Spalding thought, "increase in proportion to the teacher's acquaintance with the science of pedagogics and his skill in the practice of his art."[73]

Spalding noted that Catholics had "an educational system of their own" in 1890. He further noted that "the welfare of both the church and the state is to a great extent involved in the work which these schools perform."[74]

Spalding reminded his readers that the bishops of the Third Plenary Council had stated a twofold purpose in regard to education — " 'to multiply our schools and to perfect them.' "[75] The Council had asked that Catholic schools maintain themselves so that they would be in no way inferior to the public schools. But Spalding pointed out that the quality of the public schools varied and so the aim of Catholics should be "simply to form the best schools."[76]

Since the pastor was the head of the parish school by virtue of his office, the Council had required seminarians to "learn psychology and pedagogics, with a special view to teaching."[77] Therefore, Spalding hoped that "in every theological seminary there will henceforth be found a chair of pedagogics, in which the history and science of education will be taught."[78] Priests, however, were only in exceptional cases school teachers. Therefore, a chair of pedagogics in a seminary would not solve all the problems. Thus, the Council had also decreed that normal schools were to be established.[79]

The teachers in the parochial schools of 1890 were nearly all Catholic sisters, Spalding admitted, just as most of the teachers in the public schools were women by that time in the century. Spalding's qualms about this situation may be detected in his cryptic comment that "what the effect of this teaching by women is likely to be upon our national character, I shall not here inquire."[80] Spalding felt that "this state of things" was likely to continue, however, and so "some means must be found to increase the efficiency of our teaching communities of women."[81]

The solution Spalding proposed was the establishment of "a central Normal School, a sort of Educational University" in which the history and philosophy of education, physiology, psychology, literature "and possibly the classical languages and physics" would be taught. Spalding included the latter subjects because "the aim of a true Normal School is not merely to impart professional and technical knowledge and skill, but to give culture of mind, without which the teacher always works at a disadvantage."[82]

Not content to simply state the general idea for a Central Normal School, Spalding went on to sketch out some of its more concrete details:

> The lecture-halls and class-rooms should be in a central building, and around this the various teaching communities of women should establish houses for their younger religious. Here they would live according to the prescriptions of their respective rules, and would meet only in the lecture-halls and class-rooms. If some Catholic who has both mind and money could be induced to put up the central building and endow three or four chairs, the teaching communities could easily bear the expense of erecting their own houses. In this way we should have an Educational University which would become a source of light and strength for all Catholic teachers.[83]

This plan of Spalding's, with some modification, eventually resulted in the opening of the Sisters College of The Catholic University of America in October 1911.[84]

While Spalding was not heavily involved in the establishment of Sisters College, he was quite active in the beginnings of an Institute of Pedagogy in New York City which was affiliated with the Catholic University. One of the decisions of the University's Board of Trustees at its special meeting in April 1902 was to begin the Institute. A committee under Spalding's chairmanship was entrusted with the details of its initiation. Spalding wrote to the rector of Catholic University on May 8, informing him of the Board's action and authorizing him "to take all necessary measures for the organization and supervision of the said Institute — such as concerns the arrangement of courses, of instruction,

the appointment of teachers, the admission of students, the granting of certificates and the payment of tuition fees. I wish also to state that the Trustees heartily desire the cooperation of the University professors in this important work.''[85] Spalding suggested in particular that the departments of philosophy, history and psychology should ''lend active help'' and that professors who might take part be relieved from simultaneous duty at the University. He closed the letter with the statement that he was earnestly urging the execution of this design because he was personally thoroughly in sympathy with it, being ''fully convinced that it will greatly benefit the University.''[86] His words on the cooperation of the University professors had special meaning, since the Academic Senate had gone on record just two months earlier with the statement that ''the University is not prepared to take charge of an institute of Pedagogy in New York City.''[87]

Nevertheless, the Board had overruled the Senate at its April meeting and the directions of Spalding's letter were carried out. The reason why it was thought imperative for the University to sponsor the Institute in New York was that there were presently no means for Catholic women to be prepared for the New York principal's license under Catholic auspices. In lieu of Catholic-sponsored training, the women had been attending Columbia University, the University of New York and the Normal College of the City of New York. A memorandum to the Board stated that ''it is obvious to anyone who has any knowledge of the character of the teaching at these institutions, that our people run a great risk in attending them; the atmosphere is anti-Catholic, and if not positively hostile, is at least unsympathetic and unfair.''[88]

The memorandum continued that, by undertaking this work, the University would gain a prominence in the lives of the teachers it helped to educate and would become a popular Catholic institution. Also, according to the memorandum, the work would ''bring the University more closely in touch with those who control the educational system of the United States, and enable it to become a factor in the determination of that system.''[89] Finally, the memorandum noted that an immediate result of the inauguration of such an institution would be an ''onslaught upon the accepted textbooks, and would finally lead to the publication of textbooks that would be acceptable to Catholics.''[90]

A supplementary report to the Board indicated a problem that the Institute had encountered when it began its work in the fall of 1902. Catholic instructors who had the qualifications to teach in such an Institute were extremely hard to find. The report stated that ''the scarcity is probably due to the fact that Catholics have hitherto paid but little attention to the scientific aspects of pedagogics. There is not in any Catholic institution a (fully equipped) department of education: and the few available instructors have received their preparation in non-Catholic universities.''[91]

Spalding kept up his interest in the Institute which he had been instrumental in starting. In April 1903 he wrote the new University rector, Denis O'Connell: "Above all things keep the Pedagogical School in New York at work."[92] Again in December he wrote O'Connell: "I beg you to support the pedagogical Institute in New York. If that is allowed to drop it will cast a blight on your administration."[93]

Conclusion

Spalding set out early in his career to both rationalize and systematize parochial schools in the United States. This he was able to accomplish, despite opposition of compromisers like John Ireland. In the Edwards Law controversy, he worked out a constitutionally-based argument for parochial education. In the Catholic Educational Exhibit at the Chicago World's Fair, he was able to display the work of the parochial schools to the American public. In authoring the Baltimore Catechism, he produced what was to be the classic text in subsequent American religious education.

After establishing one of the first central Catholic high schools in the United States, Spalding worked long and hard for the establishment of a national Catholic university, which he envisioned in true Jeffersonian manner as the capstone of the meritocratic system for American Catholics. Not content to rest with a skeletal educational structure, Spalding labored further to establish a system of normal education for Catholics so that the institutions which constituted the steps on the educational ladder of Catholic education could be properly staffed.

Spalding was a social planner, not just a builder. He was confident that the system that he had consciously constructed would produce not just good Catholics, but also good citizens — at least as good, if not better, than those produced by the public schools, because parochial schools would provide character formation which was rooted in what Spalding considered the only adequate educational base: religious faith.

Just as Horace Mann had worked in the early 1800's to systematize, socialize and rationalize public education, so John Lancaster Spalding worked for the same ends for Catholic education in the late 1800's. Truly, he could be called the Horace Mann of Catholic education.

Notes

[1] William T. Harris, "Remarks introducing Bishop Spalding for Address on Higher Education of Women, at Catholic University, Washington, 1899," Library of Congress, Harris Papers, No. 620.

[2] *The Catholic Advocate*, Louisville, April 15, 1871, p. 4.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] John Lancaster Spalding, *The Religious Mission of the Irish People* (New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co., 1880), p. 139.

[7] Archives of the Diocese of Peoria, Pastoral Letter, February 18, 1895.

[8] John Lancaster Spalding, *Essays and Reviews* (New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 1877), p. 34.

[9] John Lancaster Spalding, "Pastoral Letter," *The Catholic Review*, XIX (March, 1881), 149.

[10] John Lancaster Spalding, quoted in Maurellian Schell, F.S.C., Catholic Educational Exhibit — Final Report (Chicago, 1893), p. 11.

[11] John Lancaster Spalding, *Socialism and Labor and Other Arguments* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1902), p. 65.

[12] Spalding, *Socialism and Labor*, p. 124.

[13] Spalding, *Religion and Art and Other Essays* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg and Co., 1905), p. 105.

[14] John Lancaster Spalding, "Catholicism and Apaism," *The North American Review*, CLIX (September, 1894), 282, 285.

[15] *The New World*, Chicago, September 10, 1892 (emphasis added).

[16] Charles Shanabruch, "The Repeal of the Edwards Law," Unpublished Manuscript prepared for the American Catholic Studies Seminar at Notre Dame University, October 18, 1975, p. 25.

[17] John Lancaster Spalding, *A History of the United States of America for the Use of Schools*, Introduction to John R.G. Hassard (New York: Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, 1878), p. vii.

[18] John Lancaster Spalding quoted in Maurellian Schell, F.S.C., *Catholic Educational Exhibit* — Final Report (Chicago, 1893), p. 11.

[19] A detailed description of the Catholic Educational Exhibit is contained in John Eaton, "Catholic Educational Exhibit," *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, XX (January, 1895), 66-82.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] Archives of the University of Notre Dame, J.L. Spalding to William Ohahan, Peoria, November 26, 1891.

[23] Quoted in Mary Evangela Henthorne, "The Career of the Right Reverend John Lancaster Spalding, Bishop of Peoria," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1930, p. 325.

[24] John Lancaster Spalding, "The Catholic Educational Exhibit in the Columbian Exposition," *The Catholic World*, LV (July, 1892), 580-87.

[25] *Ibid., p. 583.*

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 584-85.

[28] *Ibid.*, 585.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 586.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 587.

[31] Schell, *Catholic Education Exhibit — Final Report*, p. 65.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[34] David Francis Sweeney, *The Life of John Lancaster Spalding* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965), p. 174.

[35] Correspondence of Rev. Mark Moesslien, C.P., *American Ecclesiastical Review*, XCIII (December, 1935), 613-14.

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] For a thorough treatment of this matter, cf. John K. Sharp, "How the Baltimore Catechism Originated," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, LXXXI (December, 1929), 573-86. Quote on p. 580.

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] "Reminiscences of the 'Old Fathers,' Father Eugene Buttermann," *The Provincial Chronicle*, XIX, 1 (Fall, 1946), 30.

[40] Archives of the University of Notre Dame. J.L. Spalding to Daniel Hudson, Peoria, August 26, 1898.

[41] Archives of Spalding Institute, "Specifications submitted to Rt. Rev. J.L. Spalding by Reeves and Baillie, Architects, YMCA Bldg., Peoria, n.d.

[42] *Peoria Journal*, December 7, 1899; *The New World*, Chicago, August 6, 1898.

[43] Archives of Spalding Institute, Philip Stewart, "A History of Spalding Institute," Unpublished manuscript, 1956.

[44] Archives of the University of Notre Dame, J.L. Spalding to Daniel Hudson, Peoria, November 4, 1898.

[45] Henthorne, "The Career of the Right Reverend John Lancaster Spalding . . .," p. 320.

[46] *Ibid.*, P. 321-22.

[47] *Peoria Herald*, December 7, 1899.

[48] *The Catholic Advocate*, Louisville, January 28, 1871.

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] *Ibid.*

[52] John Lancaster Spalding, *The Life of the Most Rev. M.J. Spalding, D.D.* (New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 1873), pp. 313-16.

[53] Spalding, *The Religious Mission*, pp. 139-40.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] John Lancaster Spalding, *Means and Ends of Education* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1895), p. 181.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 224.

[57] *Ibid.*

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 222.

[60] Archives of the Catholic University of America, Original Minute Book of the Board of Trustees.

[61] *Ibid.*

[62] *Ibid.*

[63] Harold A. Buetow, *Of Singular Benefit* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970), p. 185.

[64] *Ibid.*, pp. 185-86.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[66] Sweeney, *Life*, p. 349.

[67] John Tracy Ellis, *John Lancaster Spalding* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1961), p. 50.

[68] John Lancaster Spalding, "Normal Schools for Catholics," *The Catholic World*, LI (April, 1890), 89.

[69] *Ibid.*

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 92. Spalding recommended in 1896 that "our [public] school system should be a national system." He thought this would remove the schools from the influence of politics, raise the standards of the teaching profession, make the teacher's position more secure and the recognition of his/her work more certain. John Lancaster Spalding, *Thoughts and Theories of Life and Education* (Chicago: A.D. McClurg & Co., 1897), pp. 233-34.

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[75] *Ibid.*

[76] *Ibid.*

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

[78] *Ibid.*

[79] *Ibid.*

[80] *Ibid.*, p. 95.

[81] *Ibid.*

[82] *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

[84] Ellis, *John Lancaster Spalding*, p. 82.

[85] Archives of the Catholic University of America, J.L. Spalding to Thomas Conaty, Peoria, May 8, 1902.

[86] *Ibid.*

[87] Archives of the Catholic University of America, Report of the Senate, March 12, 1902.

[88] Archives of the Catholic University of America, Memorandum in Relation to the Necessity of Establishing a School of Pedagogics in New York as part of the Catholic University, November, 1902, Board of Trustees Exhibits.

[89] *Ibid.*

[90] *Ibid.*

[91] Archives of the Catholic University of America, Supplemental Report on the Institute of Pedagogy, November, 1902, Board of Trustees Exhibits.

[92] Archives of the Catholic University of America, J.L. Spalding to Denis O'Connell, Peoria, April 25, 1903.

[93] Archives of the Catholic University of America, Same to Same, Peoria, December 5, 1903.

PART III

Education and Reform

The WCTU and Education: Canadian-American Illustrations

Nancy M. Sheehan
The University of Calgary

I

The Women's Christian Temperance Union came into existence in 1874 in the United States "as an organization of Christian Women banded together for the protection of the home, the abolition of the liquor traffic, and the triumph of Christ's Golden Rule in custom and in law." With a declared purpose "to educate the young; to form a better public sentiment; to reform so far as possible, by religious and scientific means, the drinking classes; and to seek the transforming power of divine grace for ourselves and for all for whom we work," they believed they could change society.[1] The WCTU actually grew out of a series of Women's Temperance Crusades which began in Ohio in 1873 and quickly spread to 23 states, notably Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and New York. An Ohio State Liquor Law allowed mothers and wives of drunkards to sue saloon-keepers and liquor vendors who sold alcohol to inebriated sons and husbands. A number of court cases were successful and a small band of articulate, educated, middle-class women began to see themselves as a force in the community. They organized demonstrations at courthouses and hotel bars, and campaigned to have women and children invade saloons — holding prayer meetings inside, or camping outside to try to persuade innkeepers, saloon-goers and local licensing boards of the evils of alcohol. These early campaigns were locally organized, often spontaneous, and were successful in closing hundreds of saloons, at least temporarily.[2]

Probably the more far reaching effect of these Crusades was on the women themselves. They served as an example of the strength of women; encouraged women in over 300 communities to organize local temperance unions; and revitalized women's concern for temperance reform, a concern which had surfaced before 1830. By that date the state of New York boasted 700 temperance societies and a national convention held in Philadelphia in 1833 attracted 400 representatives from 21 states. Hundreds of children's clubs were formed and youthful temperance parades held. A series of laws "to abolish public drunkenness . . . not personal or private drinking" was passed by most northern states in the early fifties. The laws were found unconstitutional, were often not enforced, and as the slavery issue heated up, the temperance forces quieted momentarily. The saloons, the public drinking, and the misery caused by alcohol in the eyes of evangelical Christians did not go away however. As the country

recovered from the aftereffects of the Civil War, as immigration and urbanization caused an increase both in the number of saloons and the problems of urban life, attention was again focused on the matter of alcoholic temperance.[3]

A Sunday School conference in Chautauqua, New York, in 1874 brought together a number of women who had been active in the temperance crusades. They agreed upon a national organization and the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union was formed.[4] Its first convention in Cleveland in November 1874 drew up this pledge: "I hereby solemnly promise, God helping me, to abstain from all distilled, fermented, and malt liquors including wine, beer, and cider, and to employ all the proper means to discourage the use of and traffic in the same." "For God and Home and Native Land" became the motto, as a constant reminder to WCTU members of the purpose and magnitude of their cause. A badge of white ribbon was adopted as the symbol of membership and a sign of the purity of the cause which they represented.[5] The purity symbol, the religious atmosphere, and the protection motto meant that women who otherwise might not have joined a non-sectarian organization, thought that the WCTU was a noble, God-fearing, righteous group.

Temperance Unions in Canada developed almost simultaneously in two towns in Ontario. In May 1874, Mrs. R.J. Doyle of Owen Sound persuaded 40 ladies to join with her in the formation of the Ladies' Prohibition League. This league was an outgrowth of the Women's Temperance Crusades in the United States. Influenced by Mrs. Mary Hunt, an energetic American leader, the league reorganized under the name WCTU. The second union, founded at Picton, late in 1874, was led by Mrs. Letitia Youmans, the most prominent early organizer of women's temperance work in Canada.[6] Youmans attended the Sunday School conference at Chautauqua, New York, and there met the women who were planning the WCTU, the women who had been active in the Women's Crusades. Inspired by these "women of mental culture, good social position and deep piety"; having discovered that the temperance crusade leaders were "suitable women" she returned to Canada and formed the famous Picton local of the WCTU, adopting the 146th psalm and the Chautauqua salute as a link with the movements' American origins.[7] At the first anniversary meeting in Cincinnati Mrs. Youmans had "come to learn," but ended up addressing the meeting. According to Frances Willard, her powerful voice, her obvious magnetism and her organizational ability told the American women that Canada had a natural leader.[8]

The spread of WCTU organizations throughout Ontario and the rest of the country followed rapidly.[9] Spurred on by visits from Letitia Youmans, Frances Willard, and other prominent leaders, unions were organized in Quebec and the Maritimes, and across the West.[10] The

Canadian movement, by the mid 1880's, stretched from coast to coast, and it became evident that there was a need for a national body to coordinate the activities of the provincial unions. Frances Willard, using the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union as an example, encouraged the Canadian women to move in this direction. The first meeting of the Dominion Woman's Christian Temperance Union was held in Ottawa in 1885. The purpose of the Dominion organization was "to unite more closely the women of the provincial unions and to devise plans for the general good, to be carried out in detail by the provinces."[11]

The American and Canadian Unions tended to be quite close and supported one another, despite a major difference in the character of the women and the methodology they used. Confronting saloon keepers, chanting outside these drinking establishments, and organizing children to taunt the over-imbibers were not tactics Canadian women felt comfortable with. The hatchet attacks of Carrie Nation made the conservative, genteel, ladylike women shudder with horror and anguish. The Canadian women were reluctant to work in public and bring attention to themselves. "We shrank instinctively from the notoriety, and from having our names and our action discussed by the vulgar and bar-room loafers." Instead of approaching the drinkers directly the women petitioned the town councils, and other agencies who sold licenses.[12] *The Christian Guardian* had early indicated support for women's temperance activities, but not the type prevalent in the U.S. It had suggested instead action on the quieter lines. "The united action of the most respectable ladies of each locality against the use of intoxicating liquors, as an article of domestic entertainment, would do much to arrest the evils of drinking" suggested the Guardian.[13]

In other ways the Unions were alike. Both were striving for a moral society; both acknowledged the Christian impetus in their work; and both acknowledged Miss Willard as the spiritual influence. The Canadian union adopted the motto, the white ribbon emblem, and the religious atmosphere of the American union. The publishing house in Evanston, Illinois produced much literature which Canadian members used, particularly because the Canadian publishing activity was very small. In addition, the "departments of work," the overall organization and the type of membership were very similar. American WCTU leaders such as Frances Willard, Mary Hunt of Massachusetts, Mary Laethrop of Michigan and Esther Pugh, the editor of the WCTU *Union Signal*, visited Canada offering advice and encouragement, attending conventions and forming local unions. Letitia Youmans, of course, was active in the American movement, campaigning in Michigan, traveling from Maine to Kansas, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York. In Maryland she even addressed the Senate and a committee of the legislature.[14] At a time when the western portions of both nations were being settled, immigrants from one country often crossed to the other. In this manner the philosophy, tactics, suc-

cesses and failures of the American WCTU had an impact on Canada.

As the organization developed, "departments of work" were established which involved the women in diverse reform interests from Sunday activities and Christian Citizenship to prison reform and work among foreigners, railroaders, lumbermen and sailors. Three areas of work require special mention. The appeal of these three departments was broad; the outcome tended to be fairly successful; and they, more than the others, operated at the political level in the society. The movements for Prohibition, Female Suffrage and Scientific Temperance Instruction involved a change in the political, social and educational arrangements of both countries. In the beginning the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was for abolition of the liquor traffic, but by persuasive means. Gradually as other organizations began to form the leaders began the long struggle for prohibition by means of government legislation. Local option, state or provincial prohibition and finally national prohibition became the goals of the Union. Of course, if women were to be successful with local option campaigns and prohibition votes generally, then the extension of the franchise to women was necessary. A Franchise Department was established which advised and aided suffrage groups, and the organization became active in a number of movements which attempted to gain greater equality for women. The third prominent activity was education, for the ladies believed that if they could get to the children, particularly, they would be able to create a "dry" sentiment in the society. They therefore attempted to reach the children through the public school and, outside school, via youth groups.

II

The Department of Scientific Temperance Instruction (STI) was the major public school arm of the WCTU.[15] Organized in 1880 under Mrs. Mary Hunt of Massachusetts, this department cajoled, bullied and persuaded Congress and the state legislatures to pass laws compelling some form of temperance instruction in the public schools. By stumping for temperance candidates, bombarding legislators with petitions and attending open hearings on a proposed bill, Mrs. Hunt and her committee managed to get STI into the schools. Strong scientific temperance legislation with penalties for non-enforcement became the norm and was endorsed by the National Education Association. However, laws alone were not enough. Temperance and hygiene textbooks needed to be rewritten to conform to the WCTU view on alcohol education. Hunt suggested that the syllabus "should teach that alcohol was a poison, should advocate total abstinence, and should avoid all references about the medical use of alcohol." This syllabus, accompanied by a petition signed by over two hundred leading citizens, congressmen, educators, chemists, medical authorities and religious leaders, was presented to the publishers. By 1892 there were 23 endorsed textbooks. Ten years later

there were an additional 10 books. By the time the Volstead Act was passed in 1919 at least two generations of American youngsters had been exposed to STI in the schools.[16]

Critics concluded that the quality of the teaching was poor. They argued that it was an attempt to indoctrinate the school children to one point of view, and that there could "be no indoctrination without misrepresentation."[17] Many believed that misrepresentation did occur. The Committee of Fifty, organized as a group of scholars and businessmen interested in temperance and who sponsored research studies, carefully examined the 23 endorsed textbooks. They found many statements they believed to be both frightening and misleading:

> A cat or a dog may be killed by causing it to drink a small quantity of alcohol. A boy once drank whisky from a flask he had found and died in a few hours. . . .
>
> Alcohol sometimes causes the coats of the blood vessels to grow thin. They are then liable at any time to cause death by bursting. . . .
>
> It often happens that the children of those who drink have weak minds or become crazy as they grow older. . . .[18]

Medical and educational experts contributed extreme views, according to the Committee. A doctor was cited as telling high school students that "any quantity of alcohol in any form was toxic and when consumed regularly produced inheritable disorders into the third generation." The dean of medicine at the University of Michigan was quoted as believing that "idiocy, deafness, and other defects of the nervous system are painfully common in children of the intemperate." These kinds of statements, along with kindergarten-type ditties such as "Tremble, King Alcohol, we shall grow up" and moral stories about the drunkard and the abstainer, caused STI to be severely criticized.[19] This criticism came from the popular press, from medical experts and from teachers and educators who abhorred not only the misrepresentation, the poor experiments and the exaggerations, but also the attempt to bring about a moral reform under the guise of science.[20]

Mrs. Hunt had authority and tradition on her side, however, and in a circular in defense of her position, consisting of reports from a committee of physicians and the endorsement of numerous Protestant churches and temperance organizations, she mounted her attack. She wrote and distributed various pamphlets and papers containing medical and scientific support. As state departments of education, schools and teachers fell into line, Mrs. Hunt was vindicated. Each year the number of children receiving some form of STI grew. Mrs. Hunt, who died in 1906 and turned over a very successful department to Mrs. Edith Smith Davis, was convinced "that there was no room for any scientific defense of the

moderate use of alcohol." She believed that the only medical evidence deemed "scientific" was that which supported the prohibition of liquor.[21]

The Department of Scientific Temperance Instruction was one of the early organized areas of work in Canada, especially in Ontario. The women believed that the supervision and education of the children would result in proper moral behavior in the children and be an influence of good for their parents. Therefore they devoted much time and energy to children's activities, particularly education. They wanted children to learn at an early age about the evils of alcohol. Thus an active STI Department operated in many areas. The Ontario STI's used three methods to influence temperance teaching in the schools: petitioning school boards; influencing teachers' receptions; and petitioning the Minister of Education to place STI on the list for examination and to authorize a textbook on the subject. The ladies wanted to begin with oral instruction for small children, to be followed with authorized textbooks for the different grade levels, more advanced courses for high school students and courses in methodology for student teachers in normal and model schools.[22]

In 1884, Minister of Education G.W. Ross promised to place the topic on the school curriculum once a week and make it a subject for examination in the model schools. Over the next few years a compulsory course was added, an examination became part of the Model School process, and in 1893 a new text, William Nattress' *Public School Physiology and Temperance* was authorized.[23] This was the highlight of WCTU success with the schools. The chronicle of events after 1893 indicated less than full cooperation, and temperance was dropped as a high school entrance examination in 1901. Although it continued to be required in forms two, three and four, its emphasis was changed from reliance on material in textbooks to teaching by example and by using everyday "incidents."[24] Both teachers and trustees had objected to the WCTU-endorsed program, arguing that the methodology was poor and that it took time away from other more important subjects.[25] Mrs. McKee, in writing the history of the Ontario WCTU, argued that the STI program in Ontario did not have the success that was experienced in the United States.[26]

If we look at STI in the western provinces the lack of success is also evident. Louise McKinney, president of the Alberta Union from 1908 to 1931, and also STI leader, had been a state evangelist for the WCTU in North Dakota before moving to Alberta and was familiar with STI in the American schools.[27] She immediately set about trying to have a temperance education program similar to the ones in the States adopted in Alberta. She was unsuccessful. Despite sympathy, assurances, and promises from the Department of Education; despite letters, interviews, and initiatives in sending suitable texts and international courses of study

for perusal; and despite co-operation from other individuals and groups, the pleas fell on deaf ears. The Department of Education made no move to upgrade its temperance and hygiene offerings. In 1922, six years after Prohibition became law in Alberta, the department finally made a temperance course compulsory, complete with a WCTU-authorized textbook and a final examination.[28]

However, it could be argued that an effective program in the schools should have had equal time in the timetable, should have met with praise or criticism from the inspectors, should have had a prominent place in the examination schedule, and should have been a part of the teacher training program at the Normal Schools. A survey of the literature and documents available revealed that this was not the case. Although the curriculum guide indicated 40 minutes per week for temperance instruction, individual teacher timetables, especially in rural areas, ignored this completely. Reminiscences by teachers who taught in the 20's do not mention the alcohol and tobacco course, although some attention was given to other "new" courses, e.g. school gardening, agriculture, manual training and physical education. A perusal of inspectors' reports found comments on just about every aspect of the school except temperance. It was not until 1927, five years after the 1922 curriculum change, that an instructor for health and hygiene was hired for the Normal School at Calgary. The first nurse and hygiene instructor for the Edmonton Normal School was on staff January 1, 1929. The examinations also revealed the lack of importance the authorities gave to this topic, showing few questions devoted to alcohol and tobacco, and in some years none at all.[29] Like Ontario, the STI department in Alberta was nowhere near as successful as its counterpart in the United States seemed to have been.

If the American studies (Sinclair, Timberlake, Gusfield, Mezinsky) are correct, then it would appear that STI in the United States and Canada had very different outcomes. Both countries had public education systems, both had active WCTU groups with STI departments, and both used much the same tactics to try and interest the educational authorities in a school temperance program. Yet the results were quite different. A closer look at the public schools in each country, in particular at the concentration of power at either the local or the state/provincial level and at the textbooks in use in the schools may help explain this variance.

III

In most areas of the United States a highly decentralized system of education was in effect. Local sentiment exerted a significant influence on the schools; local politics affected standards and courses; and lay political groups were active in school matters. The outcome of this decentralized power was that schools had to react to the wishes of their clientele, rather than to those of some central body of professionals or

bureaucrats. An effective lobby by members of the WCTU could result in hygiene and temperance courses in the schools. In addition, state legislatures could require the introduction of specific courses, which in the twenty years between 1882 and 1902 resulted in state laws requiring some form of temperance legislation throughout the country. The WCTU proved very effective in taking advantage of the political situation regarding schools to have STI made compulsory.[30]

The situation in Canada, especially Ontario, was notably different. Education was centralized at the provincial level, where the Department of Education controlled the curricula, examinations, training and certification of teachers, textbooks, and inspection of schools. This concentration of power at the provincial level made it very difficult for interest groups to affect the schools.[31] They could not appeal to individual boards and schools to change the curricula, and appeals to the Department of Education had to convince the professionals that a change was warranted.[32] In the case of temperance education it was introduced, but allowed to drop when teachers and trustees found it wanting. Sentiment to use the schools for alcoholic education does not seem to have been very strong in Ontario. This lack of local sentiment, the highly centralized, bureaucratic department and the quiet campaign of the WCTU partly explain the lack of success the WCTU experienced with their educational program.

Textbooks were also part of the temperance story. Of the textbooks used in early America the McGuffey readers were considered the most influential. Between 1836 and 1920 approximately 120 million copies of McGuffey's readers were used. In addition to using the Readers to teach students to read and to spell, McGuffey also sought to build character and to instill Christian values.[33] "They were special pleaders for temperance, sobriety and the Protestant ethic in all its attributes," concluded Gusfield.[34] Temperance was heartily endorsed by McGuffey and others. However, temperance meant, not moderation in all things, but only in the use of alcoholic beverages. Secondly, temperance did not mean moderation, but total abstinence. The readers were full of stories whose melodrama would catch the child's imagination, showing how the drinking habits of one member of the family (usually the father) lead to poverty, ruin, and death for the rest of the family.[35]

The disaster caused by one drink was a constant theme. There were innumerable tales of the disastrous effects of a single drink taken on a social occasion. Inevitably it changed even a successful and contented man into a drunkard, who ended up in complete mental, moral, and marital ruin. One story spoke of a ragged, old man who had become so because "his father gave him a drink to taste, and he became a sot, and got drunk, and beat his nice wife." On another occasion ruin was caused because the gentleman "stood treat" while running for political office.[36]

That first drink also led to other vices, abhorred by McGuffey. One story told of a Tom Smith who, after one drink, began to associate with bad companions, to gamble, and to steal. Of course playing cards for money resulted and Tom became a thorough reprobate.[37]

Another theme was that intemperance wasted time and money, leading not only to the downfall of the individual, but to national disaster as well. Alexander the Great was depicted as losing his life and his empire through intemperance: "How shocking it is to the mind, that a man who had subdued so many nations, should suffer himself to be conquered by the sin of intemperance. It is a lamentable truth, that intemperance kills more than the sword."[38] Another text continued: "The sword has slain its millions, yet, awful reflection, strong drink more!" The downfall of the Indian was attributed to rum, not the rifles of the army.[39] Drinking, in the reader, was viewed as a national disaster because it was a major cause of poverty, as well as crime, filling the almshouse as well as the penitentiary with its victims.

God, of course, punished vices, particularly intemperance. One wine-drinker tossed his empty cup out of the window, killing his son. Another was so full of alcohol that he exploded when attempting to light his pipe. A third, even more far fetched story, recounted the drunken fisherman being pulled into the water by the duck on his line.[40] According to McGuffey and other readers, intemperance caused the poverty and death of loved ones; it ruined careers and nations; it led to other vices like going "to the theater, to balls, and to suppers" instead of reading at home; and it led to damnation both in this life and eternally.

The role of women in the temperance textbooks was a double one. Women were the victims of intemperance, suffering disease, poverty and death because husbands and fathers drank away their money, lost their self-control, and treated them poorly. Mothers dying of heartbreak or anguish, children being illtreated, and suffering mental deficiencies, wives, battered and bruised by intemperate husbands, and homes being broken up were constant themes.[41] The second way women were portrayed by McGuffey was as the saviors of men, particularly the drunken, wayward man. A typical story concerned a William Wirt who had lost his first wife because of his intemperance. He approached a Miss Gamble with an offer of marriage, only to be refused until he stopped drinking. A second proposal was treated the same way. Finally, determined to reform, he swore off alcohol and they lived a happy and successful life. The lesson concluded: "How many noble minds might the young ladies save, if they would follow the example of the heroine-hearted Miss Gamble, the friend of humanity, of her country, and the relation of Lafayette."[42]

If women like Miss Gamble in the McGuffey reader had some influence over the drinking habits of men, then the Women's Crusades and the

Woman's Christian Temperance Union were not such sudden phenomena. For years McGuffey had told girls in public and high schools that they made a difference. Put in this context the Crusades and the Union followed a natural progression. It must have seemed clear to women, that like Miss Gamble, they, too, could do much to fight the evil of rum and the demon of whisky.

Perhaps, the treatment of temperance in the McGuffey and other readers also led the women to the formation of the department of Scientific Temperance Instruction. If the school reader could be used successfully as a vehicle in promoting temperance, what might be accomplished by using the school curriculum in a more direct way. The McGuffey Readers did not do enough. The temperance teaching in the school needed to be increased and made explicit. Hygiene and physiology textbooks needed to be rewritten and expanded so that medical knowledge of temperance was included. And not content to leave the content to the textbook authors and publishers, nor the teaching of it to the whim of the teachers they pushed laws through state and federal legislatures and successfully advocated "WCTU-endorsed" textbooks only. Under the leadership of the WCTU the schools had become intrinsically involved in the temperance campaign.

In Canada, Egerton Ryerson was appointed assistant superintendent of Schools for Canada West in 1844 and superintendent in 1846. The school under Ryerson was designed to encourage attitudes of brotherly love and harmony, to stress the virtues of punctuality, orderly conduct and industry, and to produce in the working class proper middle-class virtues of cleanliness, obedience, and self-reliance.[43] Like the schools of 19th century America, Ryerson's schools were to train citizens in character and moral principles. And like the American schools the textbook was an important tool for achieving these ends.

As early as 1846 Ryerson suggested to the provincial secretary a desire "that there should be uniformity in Text Books used in the schools. . . .[44] He sought suitable texts — a series of books for all ages and subjects which would give the child a broad knowledge of the universe, a deep-seated morality and a common core of Christianity, plus texts which would ensure a loyal Upper Canadian society within the embrace of the British Empire. He wanted no more insurrections like the Rebellions of 1837 and 1838, caused, as believed, by the use of "United States School Books" advocating individualism, egalitarianism and republicanism.[45] The Irish National Series was adopted and the readers, in particular, were used across the province. This policy effectively excluded American texts, particularly readers, and importantly to this study, the McGuffey Readers with their temperance sentiment.

The Irish National Readers, published by the national commissioners of education, stressed Biblical knowledge, Christian virtues and a com-

mon Anglo-Saxon heritage. The series consisted of seven anthologies of prose and poetry, covering a wide range of subjects, and serving several purposes. They taught the children to read and write, they conveyed useful information, they inculcated a certain world view and they reinforced a pious character structure. According to Ryerson the child would have a broad knowledge of the universe. The Readers taught the children of farmers, and artisans, and the poor, the virtues that would make them obedient of authority and content with their lot in life; the joys awaiting good behavior and the punishment promised for evil conduct; and a religious spirit which would be an important ideological counterforce against the free spirited rhetoric from south of the border.[46] In this emphasis on Christian morality, on biblical passages, and on uniformity, they were much like McGuffey Readers. However, in two important ways they differed: the nationalistic spirit of McGuffey was missing from the Irish Reader, which stressed an Anglo-Saxon legacy instead of Irish nationalism; and the emphasis on temperance, meaning abstinence in the use of alcoholic beverages, was also absent.[47]

Although there was temperance sentiment in Upper Canada at this time it was not reflected in the readers nor was it increased because of the reader.[48] It is not surprising that although both readers had moral, pietistic overtones, one stressed temperance and the other did not. The Irish Readers were designed, among other things, to cool down two major tension areas in Irish national life: the tension between the Protestants and the Catholics; and the tension between the British rulers and their Irish subjects. In other words, controversial subjects such as temperance would be avoided. Given the religious basis for temperance, particularly its evangelical background, the omission from the series of references to temperance with regard to alcohol, particularly temperance that meant total abstinence, was understandable.[49]

McGuffey, however, had no such problem. Textbook selection was not a centralized matter in the U.S., and as a Presbyterian minister in the Midwest, he probably reflected his own view of morality as well as his fellow evangelical Christians.[50] Schools and teachers were free to use whatever texts were available, which after 1829 included McGuffey. This view of the importance of McGuffey himself is supported by a cursory glance at Murray's English Reader.[51] The reader, prepared by an American living in England, was used in both Ontario and parts of the United States in the first decades of the nineteenth century.[52] It prompted the virtues of integrity, honor, duty, obedience, candor, custom, sensibility and discretion; it decried promiscuity and the slavery of vice. Piety, gratitude and morality were important in Murray's reader. Again, as in the Irish National Series no mention was made of temperance. McGuffey seems to have made temperance important in the schools.

The Irish National Series was followed by two series of readers: the

Ryerson Readers and the Ontario Readers. The Ryerson Readers, edited by a committee of our clergymen members of the Council of Public Instruction, replaced the Irish National Series.[53] Although organized differently they were really revised, and Canadian editions of the Irish readers and thus temperance selections were no more in evidence than previously. The Ontario Readers produced in the 1880's also bore a startling resemblance to the Irish National Readers. Virtues of courage, obedience, humility, thrift, industry, and love were extolled; vices of greed, haughtiness, dishonesty, and laziness were frowned upon. But again as in the earlier readers used in Upper Canada and Ontario, temperance was not mentioned. Stories that dealt with self-restraint and self-denial were common: for example, anger was to be controlled and material wants denied. However, temperance referring to alcohol, as in the McGuffey Readers, was absent.[54] Following the pattern of the early years the Ontario Department of Education devised readers that closely adhered to British traditions rather than relying on American attitudes. The readers and the public school were not used to create a sentiment favoring temperance, or to establish the school as a logical vehicle for strengthening the campaign against alcohol use.

Thus when the WCTU began to campaign to have temperance in the schools of Ontario, precedence was not on their side. In 1902 the Department of Education suggested that "instruction in temperance should be given incidentally from current incidents, from lessons in literature, history, etc., and especially by the example of the teacher." Ontario officials seemed particularly concerned about the scientific aspect of alcohol education and the difficulty of teaching "pathology" to children.[55] This development by the Ontario department indicated some of the problems the WCTU encountered. First of all, the teacher was encouraged to use "incidents" from lessons in literature and history. However, as we have indicated, the texts had no selections related to temperance. The ladies might well question what "incidents" the teacher would use. Second, the department was unimpressed by scientific teaching in this subject, the very method that the WCTU promoted as being up to date, factual, and of lasting significance. Only the pupils in the fourth form would get any scientific knowledge and that would "be acquired by observation of parts of animals, such as can be obtained in any butcher shop."[56] The effects of alcohol on vital organs would not be learned by means of such "scientific" experiments.

The WCTU lamented these changes and were further discouraged as agriculture gained in importance in the curriculum, crowding hygiene even further into the background. Mrs. McKee expressed the reaction of the ladies to these events:

The Education Department of the Legislature has been a familiar

point of attack ever since; and the history of STI has been one of continued and persevering combat with the powers-that-be, whose glaring obtuseness and blind ignorance, where this moral issue is concerned, has always been inexplicable to us. . . . We have not done all we might, but the opportunities of the schools as compared to those of the Temperance organizations are a 10,000 power electric light to a candle.[57]

Since education, like settlement, came late to the West, and since many of the settlers, teachers and educational professionals in the Western provinces came from Ontario, the public education systems in Western Canada as they developed during the last decades of the 19th century were strongly influenced by Ontario's system. Certainly, at least in the early years, the curriculum, the textbooks, the teacher training system, the teachers themselves, as well as the administrators and the organization, had the Ontario flavor attached to them. The Ontario Readers were the first series of texts used in the Northwest, and when the Prairie provinces eventually produced their own Alexandra Readers, they were based on the Ontario set. It is fair to say then that the organization of education generally, and the selection of authorized textbooks, were influenced by Ontario.[58] As far as a temperance curriculum was concerned this meant that in Canada there was no precendent established for using the schools to promote alcoholic temperance. This made the introduction of a scientific temperance program into the public schools much more difficult than in the U.S.

IV

To sum up then, probably a number of factors help explain the lack of success of STI in Canada vis-à-vis the United States. Mention has already been made of the influence of the McGuffey Readers and the pro-temperance sentiment if not created at least enhanced by these temperance selections. The precedent of using the school in this way was a plus for STI legislation. The choice of the National Reading Series of Ireland as the first authorized set of readers for Upper Canada meant that not only were temperance selections absent from these readers, but because the Irish readers were used as a model when Ontario produced its own readers alcoholic temperance was not included in any new or revised sets of readers. This omission was evident across the country as the newer provinces based their developing educational systems on Ontario's.

A second factor would be the personality of the STI leader in the U.S., Mrs. Hunt. A woman of intelligence, vigor and determination, she enlisted support from teachers and teacher organizations, from trustees and parents, from professional educators, the medical profession and churchmen. Never dismayed by adverse reports, she persevered until she

obtained success. The leaders in Ontario were a different breed of women; quiet, conservative, peaceful. They did not want to do anything that would attract attention to themselves or upset their communities. Petitioning school boards, influencing teachers through means of teachers' receptions and petitioning the ministers of education were the tactics they adopted.[59]

A further factor might be found in the highly centralized system of education in the Canadian provinces. The control by the department over the curriculum, textbooks and teacher training made it difficult for grass roots involvement in the school system. Unlike the U.S., where a decentralized system gave local trustees a great deal of power and individuals access to this seat of power, the tight control by the educational professionals meant that the ideas for change sponsored by a reform group would be harder to effect. In this instance the ladies of the WCTU would have to penetrate the bureaucracy of the professional department — not an easy task for non-professional women. As one commentator concluded in writing about Ontario: "So complete is the system, so carefully is every contingency provided for, that the observer . . . is apt to feel that its completeness is perhaps its greatest defect."[60] That aura of perfection was difficult for the WCTU and other reform groups to overcome. The schools in the U.S. were much closer to the people and the WCTU's program therefore, profited from that closeness.

Notes

[1] Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963, p. 86.

[2] See Andrew Sinclair, *Prohibition: The Era of Success*, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1962, pp. 24, 25; John Kobler, *Ardent Spirits: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition*, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1973, p. 136; Marcia McGovern, "The Women's Christian Temperance Movement in Saskatchewan, 1886-1930: A Regional Perspective of the International White Ribbon Movement," M.A. thesis, University of Regina, 1977, pp. 15, 16; and Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade*, pp. 88-89.

[3] Norman H. Clark, *The Dry Years: Prohibition and Social Change in Washington*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965, pp. 45-50.

[4] Norman H. Clark, *The Dry Years*, p. 150. See also "The First Seed in Our History" in Alberta WCTU 17th *Annual Convention Report*, 1929, p. 44. (Hereafter Alta. WCTU, 17 *AR*, 1929.)

[5] See John Kobler, *Ardent Spirits*, p. 136; Mary Earhart, *Frances Willard: From Prayers to Politics*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944; and Marcia McGovern, "The Woman's Christian Temperance Movement in Saskatchewan."

[6] There is a fair amount of material on these beginnings in Canada. See Letitia Youmans, *Campaign Echoes: The Autobiography of Mrs. Letitia Youmans*, Toronto: William Briggs, 1893; Mrs. S.G.E. McKee, *Jubilee History of the Ontario Woman's Temperance Union, 1877-1927*, Whitby, Ontario: C.A. Goodfellow & Son, 1927; Wendy Mitchinson, "Aspects of Reform: Four Women's Organizations in Nineteenth Century Canada," Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, 1977; Marcia McGovern, "The Woman's Christian Temperance Union," and letters and pamphlets in the WCTU Archives, Toronto.

[7] In *Campaign Echoes* Mrs. Youmans devoted a whole chapter to the Chautauqua meeting. It is evident that she had a pre-conceived notion of the kind of women who were involved in the Women's Crusades. See page 100. The 146th psalm, one of the Alleluia psalms, besides praising the Lord intoned: . . . "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is not help. . . ."

[8] Frances Willard, "Introduction" in Letitia Youmans, *Campaign Echoes*, pp. VII-XI.

[9] Wendy Mitchinson, "Aspects of Reform," pp. 154-156. Mitchinson concluded that the response was so great that it indicated that women were concerned and only needed an impetus to prod them into action.

[10] See Wendy Mitchinson, "Aspects of Reform," pp. 156-158; Letitia Youmans, *Campaign Echoes*, pp. 285, 295-299; and "The First Seed in Our History," p. 45.

[11] Wendy Mitchinson, "Aspects of Reform," pp. 159-160 and Marcia McGovern, "The Woman's Christian Temperance Union," p. 54.

[12] Wendy Mitchinson, "Aspects of Reform," pp. 151-153. The early WCTU ladies in Ontario campaigned for the Dunkin Act, which was a local option law.

[13] *The Christian Guardian*, April 8, 1972, p. 108.

[14] Letitia Youmans, *Campaign Echoes*, Youmans' American activities are found scattered throughout her autobiography.

[15] Norton Mezvinsky, "Scientific Temperance Instruction in the Schools," in *History of Education Quarterly*, 1 March, 1961, pp. 48-56.

[16] Most sources on both the story of prohibition and the WCTU devote some space to the education program of the WCTU. Generally, the authors seem to conclude that the school campaign was successful, not only in effecting the curriculum, but also in effecting the Prohibition vote. See Norton Mezvinsky, "Scientific Temperance Instruction in the Schools"; Andrew Sinclair, *Prohibition*, p. 44; Norman H. Clark, *Deliver Us From Evil: An Interpretation of American Prohibition*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1976, pp. 85, 86; John Kobler, *Ardent Spirts*, p. 143; and Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade*, pp. 85-86.

[17] Andrew Sinclair, *Prohibition*, p. 44.

[18] Ibid.

[19] John Kobler, *Ardent Spirits*, pp. 139-140.

[20] James H. Timberlake, *Prohibition and the Progressive Movement*, pp. 49-50.

[21] John Kobler, *Ardent Spirits*, p. 140 and Andrew Sinclair, *Prohibition*, p. 44.

[22] Ontario WCTU, *Annual Convention Report*, 1883, p. 20. (Hereafter Ontario WCTU *AR*, 1920.)

[23] See Ruth Spence, *Prohibition in Canada*, Toronto, 1919; Mrs. S.G.E. McKee, *Jubilee History of the Ontario Woman's Temperance Union*, 1877-1929; and William Nattress, *Public School Physiology and Temperance*, Toronto: William Briggs, 1893. See also Department of Education, Ontario, *County Model Schools: Syllabus, Text Books and Course Outlines*, for the years 1886 through 1898 for a sampling of examination questions on Hygiene.

[24] Ontario, Department of Education, *Annual Report*, 1904, p. XXVIII, (hereafter Ont. Education *AR*, 1904); and Mrs. S.G.E. McKee, *Jubilee History*, 1901 summary.

[25] See "Work of the St. Catherine's WCTU," handwritten, undated manuscript in Emma A. Currie Papers, MG 27 II, F5, Vol. 3, Public Archives of Canada; Ont. Education *AR*, 1904, p. XXVIII for examples of teacher and trustee objections.

[26] Mrs. S.G.E. McKee, *Jubilee History*, 1900 summary.

[27] Biographical material on Mrs. McKinney: J. Willard McKinney, *Louise C. McKinney*, London: Dominion Literature Depository, n.d.; WCTU files, Saskatchewan Public Archives (Regina); Hilda Ridley, *Pen Portraits of Progressive Women*, n.d., (clipping); Lillian Bertha Craigie papers, F9, Glenbow; Interview with D.H. Galbraith by Una MacLean Evans, 1962, Glenbow tape; Louise McKinney Papers, Glenbow; and Louise McKinney Papers, Public Archives of Alberta.

[28] See both the Alta. WCTU *AR* for the years from 1904 to 1930, and the Department of Education *Annual Report* for 1922.

[29] See *Annual Reports of the Department of Education* for the 1920's for "Inspectors' Reports" and "Reports of the Normal Schools." Examination papers are available in the Sessional Papers, Legislative Assembly of Alberta, Legislative Library, Edmonton. Biographies are in author's possession.

[30] Theodore R. Sizer, *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964, pp. 18-38; and A.D.C. Peterson, *A Hundred Years of Education*, New York: Collie Books, 1962.

[31] J. Donald Wilson, et. al., (eds.) *Canadian Education: A History*, Scarborough, Prentice-Hall, 1970, pp. 214-240.

[32] See two papers by R.D. Gidney and the late D. Lawr, "Who Ran the Schools? Local vs. Central Control on Policy Making in Nineteenth Century Ontario" and "Bureaucracy vs. Community? The Origins of Bureaucratic Procedure in the Upper Canadian School System," read at C.S.S.E., London, Ontario, 1978 and A.E.R.A., Spring, 1978.

[33] John H. Westerhoff, III, *McGuffey and His Readers: Piety, Morality, and Education in Nineteenth Century America*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1978, p. 14. In 1928 Henry Ford wrote: ". . . The moral principles Dr. William Holmes McGuffey stressed, the solid character building qualities he emphasized, are stressed and emphasized . . . today." p. 15. A Saturday Evening Post article, 1927, claimed that the Readers were the most significant force in the framing of national morals and tactics, p. 15.

[34] Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade*, p. 86.

[35] Richard D. Mosier, *Making the American Mind: Social and Moral Ideas in the McGuffey Readers*, New York: King's Crown Press, 1947, pp. 124, 125.

[36] Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964, pp. 317, 318.

[37] Richard D. Mosier, *Making the American Mind*, pp. 130-131.

[38] Ibid., p. 126.

[39] Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition*, p. 318.

[40] Ibid, p. 319.

[41] See Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition*, pp. 317-322, and Richard D. Mosier, *Making the American Mind*, pp. 124-131.

[42] Richard D. Mosier, *Making the American Mind*, pp. 128-129.

[43] Much work has been done on Ryerson. See especially, J. Donald Wilson, et. al. (eds.) *Canadian Education: A History*, Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall, 1970, Chapter II; and Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.

[44] Viola Parvin, *Authorization of Textbooks for the Schools of Ontario, 1846-1950*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965, pp. 20-21.

[45] Egertson Ryerson, "Special Report" to the Governor and Legislature of 1847, in J.G. Hodgins, (ed.) *Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada*,

Toronto: 1896-1910, Vol. 7, p. 110, quoted in D. Lawr and R. Gidney, *Educating Canadians: A Documentary History of Public Education*, Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1973, p. 55.

[46] Satu Repo, "From Pilgrim's Progress to Sesame Street: 125 Years of Colonial Readers," in *This Magazine*, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 12.

[47] The following texts were used to support the lack of temperance: *First Book of Lessons*, 1864; *Second Book of Lessons*, 1858; *Third Reading Book*, 1867; and *Fourth Reading Book*, 1870. These are available in the special textbook collection at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE).

[48] Like the U.S. temperance sentiment began early in Canada. See M.A. Garland and J.J. Talman, "Pioneer Drinking Habits and the Rise of Temperance Sentiment in Upper Canada Prior to 1840," in M.F.H. Armstrong, et. al. (eds.) *Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Ontario*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974. R.D. Wadsworth, *Temperance Manual*, Montreal, 1847; "Pelham Youths' Temperance Society" in *St. Catherine's Journal*, 1836; and Charles Rowell Wood, "The Historical Development of the Temperance Movement in Methodism in Canada," B.D. thesis, Victoria University, 1958.

[49] Donald H. Akenson, *The Irish Education Experiment: The National System of Education in the Nineteenth Century*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970, Chapter VI.

[50] John H. Westerhoff, III, *McGuffey and His Readers: Piety, Morality, and Education in Nineteenth Century America*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1978, p. 2.

[51] Lindley Murray, *The English Reader*, Toronto: Leslie Brothers, 1844.

[52] Viola Parvin, *Authorization of Textbooks*, p. 13.

[53] In 1865 Ryerson called two of the committee members, the Reverend Doctors McCaul and Ormeston "two of the most experienced instructors of youth in Upper Canada." Egerton Ryerson, *Report of the Chief Superintendent*, 1865, p. 10.

[54] For this summary of virtues and vices I used: *First Reader*, Part II, 1884; *Third Reader*, 1885, and *Fourth Reader*, 1885. The 1896 Ontario Annual Report indicated temperance as one of the virtues the teachers had to instill and to enforce this instruction the Report listed various selections that would appeal to the child's moral and religious nature. None of the selections had temperance as a theme.

[55] Ontario Education *AR*, 1904, p. XXVIII and McKee, 1901 summary.

[56] Ontario Education *AR*, 1904, p. XXIX.

[57] S.G.E. McKee, *Jubilee History*, 1900 summary.

[58] David J. Goggin, the first superintendent of education in the Northwest Territories came from Ontario and single-handedly shaped the system. See Neil J. McDonald, "David J. Goggin: Promoter of National Schools" in Robert S. Patterson et. al., (eds.) *Profiles of Canadian Educators*, Toronto: D.C. Heath, 1974, p. 182; A.D. Selinger, "The Contributions of D.J. Goggin to the Development of Education in the North-West Territories, 1893-1902," *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, VII, No. 1, March 1961, p. 8.

[59] Wendy Mitchinson, "Aspects of Reform," p. 227.

[60] H.T.J. Coleman, *Public Education in Upper Canada*, New York: Brandon Printing Co., 1907, p. 105, quoted in J. Donald Wilson, et. al., (eds.) *Canadian Education*, p. 239.

The Matter of Means: The Campaign and Election for the New York Free Academy, 1846-1847

Jeffrey Mirel*
The University of Michigan

Introduction

Over the past decade, educational historians have shown renewed interest in the origins of both the common and high school movements in the United States. Stimulated by Michael Katz's *The Irony of Early School Reform*, traditional interpretations of educational reform as being led by a humanitarian elite[1] or by an aspiring working class in coalition with that elite[2] have been seriously challenged. Katz saw educational reform as the imposition of schooling by the affluent classes on a "reluctant working class," while others have stressed the importance of religion and ethnicity, voluntary associations, and political parties on the shaping of public education.[3] The campaign and referendum for the New York Free Academy in 1846-47 has largely been ignored in this reassessment, except in a short section in Carl Kaestle's *The Evolution of an Urban School System*.[4] Though those events have been well-described in two early "house histories" by Mario E. Cosenza (1925) and S. Willis Rudy (1949), they have not been analyzed in terms of the current historiographic debate or with the methodology of correlation analysis.[5] This paper will address both of those considerations.

By 1847 New York was America's largest city and its commercial center. Early in the decade it had been convulsed by what Diane Ravitch has called the first "Great School War," fought between the Protestants and Catholics for control of public school funds. According to Kaestle, what emerged from that struggle was "a (public) school system that was directly controlled by the people and entirely financed from the public treasury."[6] That system, like most in that era, had no provisions for public secondary schools. At the time there were only two significant high schools in the city, one attached to New York University and the other to Columbia College. Though each received state money annually from a $40,000 "Literature Fund," each was essentially a private, tuition-charging institution with no formal attachments to the New York public school system.[7] It was in response to that situation that the campaign for the New York Free Academy began.

*I would like to thank David Angus for his criticism and support in writing this paper.

The Initial Proposal

The Free Academy owed its origin to the group of men elected to the New York Board of Education on June 1, 1846. Of the 36 Board members, 28 were Democrats, 6 were Whigs, and 2 represented the Native American Party.[8] At their first official meeting on June 10 they elected Townsend Harris, a prominent Democrat from the city's 9th Ward, as their president.[9] Harris would prove to be a capable and creative leader, for by all accounts he was the originator of the idea of the Free Academy as well as its most active and forceful advocate.

Townsend Harris was in many ways typical of the educational reformers of the 1840's. He was a man from the commercial class who "advocate(d) better conditions for working men and present(ed) high ideals to the American people."[10] "A prosperous and successful crockery merchant, Harris was an active and enthusiastic partisan of the Democratic party, a champion of universal suffrage, and of world-wide republicanism."[11] Though a member of New York's intelligentsia, he was a self-educated man, and one chronicler of the origins of the Free Academy, S. Willis Rudy, believed therein lay Harris' inspiration for the school:

> It was this happy combination of respect for learning obtained only after the greatest difficulties, and abiding faith in popular democracy, secured in active participation in its process, that fitted Harris to be the moving spirit in the establishment of an institution for a higher education which to him had been denied.[12]

Whatever Harris' motives, he presented the idea for the Free Academy at a special Board meeting on July 27, 1846, and became chairman of a three-man committee that was to look into the feasibility of such a project.[13] The other two members were Joseph Bosworth, a Democrat from the 16th Ward, and James G. King, Jr., a Whig from the 3rd Ward.[14] About six months later, on January 20, 1847, the committee reported back to the Board, submitting a majority report advocating the idea of the Free Academy signed by Harris and Bosworth and a minority report opposing the idea signed by King.[15] That split formed the basis of the ensuing political battle, for the arguments contained in both reports *and* the party alignments (Democrats in favor, Whigs opposed) would remain fairly constant as the fate of the Free Academy was decided.

When Harris first proposed the idea he believed the initial money would come from the state's Literature Fund, a $40,000 per year grant of which New York City annually received $5,000.[16] At the time the money was given to four institutions in the city — the Grammar School of Columbia College, the Grammar School of the University of the City of New York (NYU), the New York Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, and

Rutgers Female Institute.[17] The majority report argued that none of these institutions were entitled to the money:

> The Literature Fund was established with the design of encouraging the establishment of Academies and Classical Schools, and *that the liberal bounty thus awarded by the State might so reduce the expenses of the same that many who otherwise would be debarred therefrom could participate in the instruction of said schools. It was intended to benefit the public.* (Emphasis added.)[18]

Since the school for the deaf and dumb and the female institute were not "Academies" or "Classical Schools," and since Columbia and NYU were private, exclusive and profit-making institutions which did not really "serve the public," it seemed to Harris and Bosworth that the state funds were being improperly used.

It was the elitism of the two grammar schools that most disturbed Harris and Bosworth. Not only did both schools receive public funds, but they then charged tuition which put them beyond the reach of most common school students.[19] In addition to that, the majority report authors felt that the curricula of the two schools were so irrelevant to the lives and needs of the majority of New Yorkers as to preclude them sending their children to those schools even if they could.[20] They noted "that many of the branches most important to a manufacturing, agricultural and commercial people are entirely neglected in these schools."[21] Harris and Bosworth then added their most damning bit of evidence:

> Your committee confess their morification in declaring the fact that in this great and wealthy city, the commercial metropolis of the New World — only two hundred and forty-five of your youth (were in the Columbia and NYU schools).[22]

The city's population at the time was over 400,000.

The majority report argued that the only reasonable alternative was to end the "mis-appropriation of funds" and channel the state money to the proposed Free Academy. They believed they were defending the cause of the many against the interests of the few. True to the "humanitarian" model, Harris and Bosworth argued for the rights of common school students, the children of the laboring class.[23] They wrote:

> (Such a Free Academy) where Chemistry, Mechanics, Architecture, Agriculture, Navigation, physical as well as moral or mental Science, etc., etc., are thoroughly and practically taught, would soon raise up a class of mechanics and artists, well skilled in their several pursuits, and eminently qualified to infuse into their fellow-workmen a spirit that would add dignity to labor — a spirit congenial

> with the character of our Republican institutions, while at the same time the diffusion of correct knowledge among the working class of our population would make them better acquainted with their inestimable value.[24]

The idea that the Free Academy would be accessible to the children of the working class was one of the strongest, most recurring arguments its proponents used in the battle for its creation.

The report concluded with four resolutions advancing the establishment of the Free Academy. The first requested that the state hand over to the Board of Education the city's share of the Literature Fund for the creation of the school. The second asked that the Board be granted the power to raise taxes for the Academy's construction and support. The third referred to the Board's governance of the school and the fourth to the Board gaining title to all real property that was connected with it.[25] The first two regulations were to be the target of most of the criticism that arose around the proposal.

As much of the tone and substance of the arguments favoring the Free Academy originated in the majority report it is hardly surprising that much of the criticism took its cue from James G. King, Jr.'s minority report, which opposed the school. But more was engendered by King's opposition than mere arguments, for positions of party and class entered the conflict, as well. In the context of the struggle between rich and poor for equal educational opportunity, the terms in which Harris and Bosworth saw the battle, King's status was unmistakable. Mario E. Consenza wrote of him in *The Establishment of the College of the City of New York:* "Mr. James G. King, Jr. and the families with which his own was connected were the perfect types of the day for the aristocracy of position, of wealth, and of birth."[26] King's opposition, which remained constant throughout the debate, served to sharpen the class and party divisions that emerged on the issue.[27]

King's minority report challenged the majority report on three fundamental areas. The first was that the Literature Fund "was established and maintained for the support and assistance of the Incorporated Academies as distinguished from the Common Schools or Colleges of this state. . . ."[28] By implication the grammar schools of Columbia and NYU were entitled to state money since both were legally incorporated academies, their private nature notwithstanding. The second was that the Board of Education's jurisdiction covered only the common schools of the city and that it was not "within the province of the Board to interfere with another part of that same system."[29] Third, and finally, by using state funds to back *only one* institution, the "free market" competition between the area's academies would be undermined and the education of all secondary students would suffer.[30] It is worth noting that King did not

reject the *idea* of increased educational opportunities for children of the working class. Rather, he opposed the particular means of achieving that end. The Whig Party followed King's lead and, throughout the campaign, based their attacks on questions of jurisdiction, threats to existing institutions, and fears of increased taxes.

The vote on the two reports was put off until the next Board meeting, Wednesday, February 10, 1847. On that day, following assurances that money would still be available to the school for the deaf and dumb, a protest from representatives from the Rutgers Female Institute, and debate over several amendments (all of which failed), the four resolutions were approved, and preparations were made to send them off to Albany. To expedite the task and write the legislation a new committee was formed, consisting of Townsend Harris, James Bosworth and John L. Mason, a Whig from the 15th Ward.[31] Mason, a lawyer, wrote the draft which was introduced as Senate Bill 125 on March 22, 1847.[32] A nearly identical piece of legislation was introduced on April 10, as Assembly Bill 381. As the bills moved through the various committees they received two significant additions: the first limited the taxing power of the Board to $50,000 for building construction and $20,000 per year for operating expenses; and the second required popular approval of the plan in a city-wide referendum.[33] With those stipulations, votes were taken first in the Senate on May 5, 1847, where Senate Bill 125 was passed 18 to 3[34] and then in the Assembly on May 7, where it passed 63 to 30.[35] On that same day Governor John Young, a Whig, signed the bill which became Chapter 206 of the Laws of 1847.[36] The stage was thus set for a popular referendum on free high school education to be held the first Monday of June.

The Newspaper Debates

During the almost three months in which the Free Academy was debated in Albany, the newspapers of New York City engaged in a lively debate of their own on the same issue. It began soon after the January 20th Board meeting where the majority and minority reports were first read. Not surprisingly, many of the newspapers echoed the partisan views and the arguments presented in those reports. Nine days after the meeting, the Democratic newspaper, *The Daily Globe*, summarized the majority report and ran an editorial entitled "A Free College for the Millions," stating:

> We think this plan must commend itself to the favorable considerations of all who desire to see the rising generation, poor as well as rich, in the enjoyment of those benefits of education which are calculated to elevate them and make them useful members of society.[37]

On that same day, however, "the New York *Commercial Advertiser*, a staunch Whig paper,"[38] though declaring itself in favor of the idea, in principle, noted that "the principal difficulty and the only objection is the question of ways and means."[39] The editorial attacked the removal of public support for the school for the deaf and dumb, and added that no limit was put on the Board's power to tax, that taxes were already "pressing so heavily upon the people of the city and county of New York;" and, finally, argued that the whole scheme was probably not in the Board's jurisdiction anyway.[40] Thus, from the outset the party lines were clearly established and, although there was a gray area in which papers like Greeley's *Tribune* and the *Subterranean* (the former, a Whig paper which was pro-Academy, and the latter, a Democratic paper which an anti-Academy), by and large the positions followed party lines.

A ready example was the *Morning Courier and New York Enquirer*, "edited by Col. J. Watson Webb, a staunch advocate of Whig principles."[41] The *Morning Courier* was one of the more outspoken critics of the proposed school but its objections rested on somewhat different grounds from those of the *Commercial Advertiser*. Beginning on February 20, the paper published and applauded a series of three letters signed by "Justice" which stated that the Free Academy was unnecessary because schools like NYU were already providing scholarships to over half their students.[42] Noting "that no indigent applicant has ever been turned away on account of his poverty," "Justice" asked rhetorically, "what have we then but a Free College already founded on the most liberal scale?"[43]

On March 2, the *Morning Courier* published a letter which answered "Justice" but not in a way he was likely to appreciate. Signed by "Plain Truth," the letter stated that those "free scholarships" were, in fact, only given to "the sons, relatives, or presentees of *individuals* holding the Bonds of the University, men who have purchased and paid for perpetual instruction of a student."[44] The institution hardly fit the bill of a free academy and, furthermore, "Plain Truth" went on, even if it did, its curriculum remained irrelevant and backward.

In the remainder of the interchange, "Justice" never fully refuted the scholarship charge, nor did he explain why there were so few secondary scholars in so large a city. The arguments shifted, with "Justice" defending NYU's curriculum and suggesting that the new school would respond to political pressure and "lower its standards" to appease its working class constituency.[45] Lastly, he conjured up the ghost of sectarian conflict rising around the proposed curriculum in the school.[46] "Plain Truth" dismissed the idea of political pressure on the school and damned "Justice" for attempting to "renew the disgraceful contest in which the *Holy Bible, God's Holy Word* was dragged through the common sewers of party warfare."[47] It is, again, worth noting that neither "Justice" nor the

Morning Courier expressed any hostility to the idea of popular education.[48]

The other important Whig newspaper, *The Journal of Commerce*, while following essentially the same line, introduced one new and troubling argument. Noting that only a few students would be able to take advantage of the Free Academy, the editorial said:

> . . . and those few are likely to be, most of them, from those classes who have time to spare, and money, too, for special studies. In other places, public high schools have yielded their advantages very much to the children of the rich; so that the intended order has been reversed, and the poor have educated the rich. Such in all probability would be the result of this charity, though not so intended at the outset.[49]

The question of whether the Free Academy would, in reality, serve the people for whom it was intended was indeed disturbing. Furthermore, those specific doubts were intensified by the fiery writings of Mike Walsh, the Democratic State Assemblyman from the twelfth district (14th Ward).

Mike Walsh, an Irish-immigrant, working-class leader, often opposed the stated position of the Democratic Party. He was called many things during his career and "maverick" was one of the mildest. It was an image he courted for, as he often said, "Any dead fish can swim with the stream, but it takes a real live one to go against the current."[50] He was one of the 30 assemblymen who voted against the Free Academy bill,[51] and was greatly dismayed to find that in his absence his own newspaper, *The Subterranean*, had endorsed the proposal as "the beginning of a system which will elevate the sons of toil to their true position in society."[52] A week later Walsh thoroughly repudiated that stand and set *The Subterranean* squarely in opposition to the Free Academy.

Walsh's editorial of May 22 appeared under the title "Let Every Workingman Read This!"[53] He began by stating that the bill "was smuggled through the legislature by every species of bribery, bargaining and fraud" and it was endorsed in *The Subterranean* by a man "who was temporarily connected with the paper during (my) absence" and who was ignorant of all the facts.[54] The facts, as Walsh saw them, pointed to one truth:

> (The Free Academy) will be *free* like West Point Academy and the Normal School at Albany — to the favored few who are perfectly capable of educating their children out of their own surplus without quartering them upon the public.[55]

The Whig *Journal of Commerce* had found an unlikely ally.

Like the Whigs, Walsh praised the public schools. For him, the only changes or expansion the system needed was the "feeding and clothing (of) those who must drudge all day, and not infrequently half the night to obtain (an education)."[56] Walsh assumed that the Free Academy would siphon funds away from where they were most needed and create just another elitist institution. He believed the entrance examinations would be rigged so that the only means of admission to someone "who is not the relative of some member of the Board of Education, or of one of their most intimate cronies (would be) the magic of a bribe secretly paid by his parents for the privilege."[57] The editorial urged every workingman to vote against the proposal, the watchword being: "No learning monopolies supported at the public expense. Improve the public schools and let all have a fair start."[58]

The problem for the average New York workingman, at this point, was determining who his friends were and where his best interests actually lay. The "militantly Democratic paper,"[59] the *Daily Globe*, however, had no doubts. In an editorial published on May 25, the paper declared:

> The inevitable consequence must be to render our Common Schools additionally efficient and to elevate and advance education in these schools. Under such a system no one, no matter what may be the avocation of his parents nor how limited their means, will be disheartened in his efforts to acquire the most valuable education. He finds the facilities provided by the enlightened liberality of our people. Every child of superior promise or extraordinary industry will have the means of acquiring an education which will fit him to honorably fill any position in life, and to be a blessing to any class of society in which his lot may be cast.[60]

The editorial stated that no better institution than the Free Academy could be devised for "improving the moral and intellectual powers of the individual citizen "while, in addition, keeping alive "this unconquerable hope and faith of an improved condition" in life.[61]

The other Democratic-leaning paper, the *Herald*, also came out strongly for the Free Academy arguing that New York should follow Boston's lead in establishing a tax supported high school and that

> (The Free Academy) will elevate too many of the unfortunate — enrich too many minds that might otherwise lie waste — increase too rapidly the lovers and defenders of the republic, and recruit too fast the ranks of the virtuous and wise, to be rejected by our fellow citizens.[62]

The other major paper that backed the Academy was Horace Greeley's *Tribune* which, like the *Subterranean*, crossed party lines on this issue. While generally taking Whig positions the paper endorsed the Free Academy, though hardly with great enthusiasm. The best the *Tribune* could muster was the ambiguous statement:

> On the whole, we are inclined to favor the Free Academy, though maintaining that the whole People should not be taxed to provide for the education of the children of part of the people.[63]

In fact, the *Tribune* support was so lukewarm as to elicit comment after the election from the *Evening Mirror*, a small, pro-Academy paper, which said:

> Even the *Tribune* that goes into daily hysterics for the good of the people had not the courage to approve this great scheme for the benefit of the poor.[64]

As the election approached, the editorials were complemented by a flurry of letters to the editor. Although many merely repeated positions heard elsewhere, four letters are worthy of note due to the originality of their arguments, and one due to the identity of its author — Townsend Harris. Several of the letters, including Harris', first appeared in the *Journal of Commerce*, and, with the obvious exception of Harris', supported the paper's anti-Free School stand.

The first letter, published on May 22, was written by a man who identified himself as "A Mechanic" and a school trustee (probably in the Public School Society) for the previous 20 years.[65] He began with the stock arguments about taxes being too high already and that enough "higher education" was already available in the ward common schools. But in the letter's last paragraph, an argument was presented that, as far as could be ascertained, was the *only* public pronouncement that attacked not only the means but the very idea of giving advanced education to working class children. He wrote:

> My conclusion, therefore, is that to send the children of persons possessing small means to college, is doing them an injury rather than a favor. It is of this description of college educated individuals that the ranks of pettifoggers and quacks are filled. They are too proud of their superior education to work either as clerks or mechanics, or to follow any active business except what is termed professional; and are, therefore, compelled to resort to deception or chicanery to gain a support.[66]

The other letters followed more traditional approaches, generally concentrating on the idea that the school system was quite good enough and

needed no expansion. On May 26, 1847, the *Journal of Commerce* ran a letter that denounced the Free Academy for that reason and to prove its point listed the 25 course offerings in the Male Department and the 19 courses in the Female Department of Ward School #5.[67] On June 5, the *Commercial Advertiser* printed a letter which argued the same position but from the other end of the educational spectrum, stating that there was no need for a Free Academy since NYU and Columbia would, with more scholarship money, expand the number of poor students in their program.[68] The last of these anti-Free Academy letters appeared in the *Evening Post* on the Saturday just preceding the election. It is proof that Mike Walsh's and the *Journal of Commerce's* question as to who would actually benefit from the school had its advocates among the people, as well. Signed "S.T.," the letter ends on this note:

> It should be recollected that mere tuition, mere instruction, is but a small part of the expenses of a student. He must subsist — he must be fed and clothed, and he must be provided with books. He who is able to meet these expenses will not find it a great additional hardship to pay his tuition bills. Those who are in absolute poverty cannot, therefore, take advantage of the instructions of the Free Academy. Only those who are in certain degree well off will be able to attend it. The taxes will therefore not be levied for the benefit of the poor — they will be paid by the whole community for the benefit of those who could afford to bear the expense of their own education.[69]

The Free Academy did have its supporters among those who were inclined to write letters to the editor. A strong endorsement came on May 27, in the *Evening Post* which lauded the school as a place where, due to its pragmatic curriculum (including metallurgy, civil engineering, chemistry, etc.) "it will give us intelligent mechanics, whose influences among our people extending throughout the union and reacting upon ourselves, cannot fail to elevate our national character."[70]

Probably the most influential correspondence of them all came from Townsend Harris, himself. Appearing in the *Journal of Commerce* and the *Evening Post* on June 5, the long and carefully argued letter attempted to answer the major criticisms leveled at the proposed Free Academy. He began by generally dismissing the idea that the common schools offered as wide and thorough a course of study as students might need. Specifically, he pointed to the letter of May 26 that appeared in the *Journal of Commerce* which listed the course offerings at one of the ward schools. While noting that it was a fine list, Harris was certain that it was impossible to cover all the topics, let alone cover any thoroughly.[71] The better, more curious students, of course, would be short-changed. He added, again, the idea that the Free Academy would deal in courses to

help prepare young men for "future vocations:"

> Thus to the intended mariner, navigation will be taught. To the future carpenters, instruction in the mechanical powers, architecture and certain amounts of mathematics. To the smith's apprentice, instruction in metallurgy and something of chemistry.[72]

With that in mind he dismissed those who saw the expansion of Columbia and NYU Grammar Schools as a way to avoid creating the Free Academy, for those schools dealt primarily in classical subjects. To the charge that such advanced learning would spoil "a large number of youths for useful pursuits," Harris replied:

> Instead of spoiling our youth or disgusting them with productive pursuits, it is intended to elevate those callings, and to raise the mechanic from being a mere machine to the place of a man of science, operating under laws which he has studied and understands.[73]

In relation to taxes, he called the amount trivial, and, like the *Herald* editorial of May 31, he pointed to Boston, noting, "with a population only one-fourth of ours, (Boston) expends annually more money for the instruction of her youth than we do with four times her population."[74] Finally, Harris seemed to turn directly to Mike Walsh and the charge "that children would be selected to favor the politics of the parent."[75] He explained that the Board of Examiners would be totally separate from the school or the Board of Education and that the scholars it considered were required "to have obtained all the information given in the average Public Schools."[76] Harris, then, rested his case, and left it in the hands of the voters.

All the electioneering, of course, did not take place in the newspapers alone, although that is obviously the easiest to document. Several days before the election, signs were posted around the city, stating: "Free Academy for the poor man's children."[77] Handbills were also distributed with the words "No Free Academy"[78] on them. But probably the most important political actions took place at various Democratic party caucuses around the city. Cosenza noted that the week before the election, party meetings were held in the 1st, 5th, 6th, 7th, 9th, 10th, 13th, 14th, 16th wards with the express purpose of endorsing the Free Academy and working for its passage.[79] They and others must have done their work well for on June 7, 1847, the people of New York voted the Free Academy into existence. The vote, however, must have astounded even the most ardent supporters of the plan for the measure passed in all 18 wards with a final tally of 19,305 in favor to only 3,409 opposed.

TABLE 1

Final Election Results of the Vote on the Free Academy, June 7, 1847

Ward	Votes For	Votes Against	Total Vote	% For	
1	706	203	909	78	
2	322	109	431	75	
3	705	172	877	80	
4	1196	67	1263	95	
5	929	247	1176	79	
6	1104	86	1190	92	
7	1165	421	1586	73	
8	1636	168	1804	91	
9	1379	173	1552	89	
10	1067	284	1351	79	
11	1341	39	1380	97	
12	659	86	745	88	
13	1212	66	1276	95	
14	1262	136	1398	90	
15	808	450	1258	64	
16	1321	281	1602	82	
17	1465	289	1754	83	
18	1034	137	1171	88	
Totals:	**19305**	**3409**	**22714**	**85**	**(Average −80)**

Analysis of the Electorial Results

Analysis of educational reform in the 1840's has followed several important patterns of interpretation, each emphasizing one particular aspect of American society in the era. Both Carlton and Katz have focused on class conflict, though Katz has argued that the expansion of educational systems to include high schools was resisted, not sought, by the working class.[81] Diane Ravitch and David Angus have pointed to the importance of ethnic and religious backgrounds in the political battles over the creation and expansion of schooling during the 1840's.[82] Others, like Robert Church, have stressed the importance of political parties in the common and high school movements, seeing both as expressions of Whig interest in "internal improvements."[83] In our analysis of the Free Academy referendum each of those interpretations will be tested, as well as one additional interpretation, the relationship between the Free Academy vote and public or private school enrollments.

In assembling the data for this study, a variety of sources were sought out. The most helpful was the *New York State Census of 1845*, which provided ward level data on 17 of the 18 wards of the city (Ward 18 being

created between the time of the census and the election). The census provided a wealth of information in several important areas, notably: the numbers of eligible voters; birth places and naturalization statistics; percentages of school age children (5-16) enrolled in common and private schools; and some occupational data. The greatest drawback in the census information was the lack of data on religious affiliation. Though numbers and locations of churches and synagogues were listed, no confident generalizations could be drawn from that material. In addition, Irish immigrants (who had played so prominent a role in Ravitch's "School War") were included with all people born in Britain and possessions. These factors make it virtually impossible to test an ethno-religious interpretation of this election. Data on other New York City elections of the era were readily available. Mayoral election returns were taken from the *New York State Register for 1845-46*, the *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York for 1848* and *1849* (which also provided real and personal property data) and the New York *Herald* of April 15, 1847.

In all, the variables used for this analysis fell into five distinct categories. The first included percentages of the Democratic vote in the 1847 mayoral election (which took place less than two months prior to the Free Academy referendum) and percentages of the average Democratic vote in the 1845, 1846, 1848 and 1849 mayoral races. The second included average real and personal property holdings listed on a per capita basis for all people in each ward and on a per voter basis. Third was the average common and private school enrollments as compared to total school-age children (5-16) in each ward. Fourth was occupational statistics which included professionals, manufacturers, merchants, mechanics and all others. Finally, the nativity data was considered, which included New York, New England, all other U.S. states, Britain and possessions, and Germany as the listed categories. Using all those factors a correlation matrix was created.[84] The results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Rank Order of Correlation Coefficients With the Pro-Free Academy Vote as the Dependent Variable

Rank	Variable	Correlation Coefficient*
1.	% of School Age Children in Common Schools	.7346
2.	% of the Democratic Vote for Mayor in the 1847 Mayoral Election	.7243
3.	Average of the % of Democratic Votes for Mayor in the 1845, 1846, 1848, 1849 Elections	.6924

4.	% of School Age Children (5-16) in Private Schools	−.6848
5.	% of Professionals (Attorneys, Clergymen and Physicians)	−.5370
5.	% Born in New England	−.5259
7.	Average Real Property Per Voter (Based on eligible voters, 1845 NY State Census)	−.5255
8.	Average Real Property per Capita	−.4906
	Not Significant at .05 or Better	
9.	Average Personal Property/Voter	−.3897
10.	Average Personal Property Per Capita	−.3635
11.	% of Merchants	−.3485
12.	% Born in Germany	.3127
13.	% Born in U.S. States Other Than New England and New York	−.2901
14.	% of Occupations Other Than Professionals, Merchants, Manufacturers, Mechanics	.2742
15.	% of Unnaturalized Persons	.2589
16.	% of Mechanics	.2428

*Significance: .05 = .4821; .01 = .6055[85]

A number of significant conclusions can be drawn from this correlation analysis. The most important is the relationship between common school enrollment and strong support for the Free Academy (.7346). Apparently the voters agreed with Townsend Harris that the Free Academy would offer a hitherto unavailable opportunity for children who attended common schools. In that light, it is also not surprising to find a strong negative correlation between support for the Free Academy and private school enrollment (−.6848). The pattern that we saw developing in the political and newspaper debates, centering on private versus public secondary schools was paralleled by the pattern of the voting.

The second important conclusion concerns the relationship between ward level Democratic strength and support for the Free Academy. Once again there is a significant correlation between both the average Democratic vote in the 1847 mayoral race and the four-year average of Democratic mayoral strength in the years immediately preceding and following the referendum and support for the Free Academy (with coefficients of .7243 and .6924, respectively). The generally partisan nature of the issue revealed in the debates is underscored by these results. Proposed by Townsend Harris, a leading Democrat, endorsed by a Democrat-dominated school board, by Democratic caucuses on the eve of the election, by all but one of the city's Democratic newspapers, the Free Academy appears to have been, in Cosenza's words, "the work of the

Democratic Party of the City of New York."[86] Our analysis of the election certainly bears this out.

As the table indicates, occupation and birthplace were not generally important variables. Only the percentage of professionals and the percentage of those born in New England had significant correlations to the Free Academy vote (with −.5370 and −.5259 coefficients, respectively). However, neither group accounted for more than 10 percent of the population of any ward with professions averaging less than 2 percent and New Englanders less than 5 percent city-wide. There were simply not enough of these people in the city to link them closely to the election outcome. Average real property ownership on a per capita and per eligible voter basis, on the other hand, does appear to point to an additional factor in the election. The significant negative correlation of both these measures (−.5255 and −.4906, respectively) to the Academy vote suggests that property owners resisted the tax increase. Once again, we see a significant element of the public debate emerging as a factor in the actual voting.

Finally, if we analyze the two strongest correlations to the Free Academy vote, common school enrollment and Democratic party strength, in relation to one another, an additional conclusion can be drawn. Common school enrollment and both the Democratic vote in 1847 and the Democratic average for the bracketing years (1845-46, 1848-9) correlate in a strong, positive way (.7692 and .7312, respectively) while Democratic strength correlates negatively to private school enrollments (−.7669 in 1847, and −.7871 in the bracketing years). There is a strong suggestion here that Democratic voters were sending their children to the common schools and that they saw the Free Academy as a chance to increase their children's educational opportunities.

This statistical analysis of the election reveals dramatic parallels to the patterns we have seen established in the newspaper and political debates. The issues that were raised in the public forums appear to have been the issues the voters were concerned about, namely; increased educational opportunities for common school children in public not private high schools, Democrat versus Whig party politics, and the reluctance of the city's more affluent classes to raise their taxes for support of a free, public high school.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are at odds with the work of two prominent educational historians, Michael Katz and Robert Church. After interpreting the 1860 vote to abolish the high school in Beverly, Massachusetts, Michael Katz stated in *The Irony of Early School Reform* that "on the local level partisan politics were simply irrelevant, in this

period, to educational reform."[87] Katz's statement was based on the fact that wealthy, civic leaders like Dr. Wyatt Boyden, a Whig, and Robert Rantoul, a Democrat, joined forces to promote the Beverly high school.[88] But, as we have seen in New York in 1847, the issue of the Free Academy was intimately tied to the political battles between the city's Whig and Democratic parties.

The nature of that partisan conflict becomes clearer if we consider one of the major ideas in Lee Benson's *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy*. Benson saw the period of American history after 1815 as a time where an egalitarian revolution took place.[89] By the 1840's, he wrote, "both parties (Whigs and Democrats) accepted egalitarianism as the ideology of the Good Society."[90] "Thus," he continued, "if we accept the egalitarian revolution concept, we are in a better position to see that during the 1830's and 1840's political battles were less over ends than means."[91] In that context, the importance of party lines in the Free Academy election becomes clear. The recurring theme of the Whig versus Democrat political newspaper debates *was* means. For all their opposition to the plan, the Whigs never challenged the idea that workingmen's children should have an equal chance for higher education.

The problem at this point, however, is that if we continue to use Benson's model we must see that the Democrats and Whigs of New York City in 1847 had taken each others' positions. Robert Church, in *Education in the United States*, explained the educational ramifications of Benson's insight. Church noted that because the Whigs advocated what Benson called the "positive liberal state" (which sought to use governmental power to stimulate industrial growth, trade, and a national market) they also provided leaders in the movement for public education.[92] Church argued that leaders like Horace Mann and Henry Barnard (both Whigs) saw schools as a means to stimulate economic growth, produce better workers, and curtail the breakdown of traditional values that accompanied rapid industrial growth.[93] In addition, schools were often presented as an avenue of upward mobility for members of the working class. Yet those were precisely the positions that Townsend Harris, a Democrat dominated school board, Democratic newspapers, the party and Democratic voters supported in the campaign and referendum on the Free Academy. Those results directly contradict Church's contention that major school reform in the 1840's was the work of Whig reformers alone.[94] While the Free Academy election may serve to temper sweeping statements on which political party promoted public education most vigorously, it does underscore Benson's fundamental idea that egalitarianism was the underlying ideology of the age.

With that in mind, Michael Katz's belief that class conflict rather than "egalitarian consensus" was the moving force behind early school reform must also be questioned. For Katz, the Beverly high school vote

was clearly a contest of rich against poor. He wrote:

> . . . the vote on Beverly High School and other data imply that the people of most wealth and prestige in communities, often joined by more middle level social positions, supported educational innovations especially the establishment of high schools.[95]

But in the case of the New York Free Academy election the strong correlation between common school enrollment and support for a public high school, the partisan nature of the campaign, the lack of clear occupational class differences over the issue, as well as the negative relation of ward level real property holdings to support for the the Free Academy all contradict Katz's argument of educational reform by imposition.

Katz has also argued:

> Very largely . . . movements of urban reform have been impositions; communal leaders have mounted an ideological and noisy campaign to sell education to an often skeptical, sometimes hostile, and usually uncomprehending working class.[96]

Katz saw the generally working class vote to abolish the Beverly High School as one instance where the true voice of the working class was heard from amid that upper class din.[97] Once again, the evidence of the New York vote challenges that assumption. As the newspaper debate revealed there was as noisy a campaign to defeat the Free Academy as to sell it. In this instance, it cannot even be argued that the people were unaware (or "uncomprehending") of the choice they were making. Mike Walsh and the editors of the *Journal of Commerce* presented arguments about the potential misuse of the Academy that are strikingly similar to Katz's. In fact, Katz's statement that "what they [the wealthy and middle classes] were doing was spreading throughout the whole community the burden of educating a small minority of its children"[98] is almost exactly what "S.T." argued in his anti-Free Academy letter of June 5, 1847 (quoted above). Nevertheless, New York's Democrats and its less affluent voters appeared to have given the Free Academy their unqualified backing and, as Carl Kaestle noted, "the available evidence tends to vindicate the faith of the electorate and the intentions of the Democrat-dominated Board of Education, at least in terms of the range of backgrounds of those admitted to the Adademy."[99] Kaestle's analysis of the occupational backgrounds of the parents of the Free Academy students from 1849-1854 reveals that except for Black students and those from the bottom quarter of the work force "the enrollment was quite mixed and the term 'People's College' was not inappropriate."[100]

The evidence surrounding the creation of the New York Free Academy

demands a reconsideration not only of the idea of a Whig-dominated school reform movement, but of the belief in educational reform by imposition as well. Indeed, Frank Tracy Carlton's interpretation of a "humanitarian" elite uniting with less affluent, newly enfranchised voters of the Jacksonian era,[101] to expand working class educational opportunities is the one interpretation most clearly supported by the events in New York City in 1846 and 1847.

Notes

[1] Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1919).

[2] Frank Tracy Carlton, *Economic Influences Upon Educational Progress in the United States* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965).

[3] David Angus, "Detroit's Great School Wars: The School Politics of a Frontier City, 1836-1853." Unpublished paper presented at Teachers College, Columbia University, December 7-8, 1979; Robert Church, *Education in the United States* (New York: The Free Press, 1976); Michael Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968); Diane Ravitch, *The Great School Wars* (New York: Basic Books, 1974).

[4] Carl Kaestle, *The Evolution of an Urban School System* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 104-109.

[5] Mario E. Cosenza, *The Establishment of the College of the City of New York as the Free Academy in 1847* (New York: The Associate Alumni of the College of the City of New York, 1925); S. Willis Rudy, *The College of the City of New York: A History* (New York: The City College Press, 1949).

[6] Kaestle, *The Evolution*, p. 80.

[7] Ibid., p. 104.

[8] Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 8.

[9] Ibid., p. 10.

[10] Carlton, *Economic Influences*, p. 42.

[11] Rudy, *The College*, p. 10.

[12] Ibid., p. 11.

[13] Cosenza, *Free Academy*, pp. 12-14.

[14] Ibid., p. 14.

160

[15] Ibid., p. 15.

[16] Ibid., p. 13.

[17] Ibid., p. 18.

[18] Ibid., p. 19.

[19] Ibid., p. 24.

[20] Ibid., p. 25.

[21] Ibid., p. 25.

[22] Ibid., p. 28.

[23] Ibid., pp. 29-30.

[24] Ibid., p. 30.

[25] Ibid., pp. 32-33.

[26] Ibid., p. 37.

[27] Ibid., p. 37. King stuck to his position throughout the course of the debate over the Free Academy. Six months after he presented his minority report he cast the only negative ballot on the final School Board vote concerning the creation of the Academy.

[28] Ibid., p. 35.

[29] Ibid., p. 35.

[30] Ibid., p. 36.

[31] Ibid., pp. 52-59.

[32] Ibid., p. 89.

[33] Ibid., p. 126.

[34] Ibid., p. 114.

[35] Ibid., pp. 117-118.

[36] Ibid., pp. 127-128.

[37] *Daily Globe*, January 29, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 44.

[38] Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 43.

[39] *Commercial Advertiser*, January 29, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 44.

[40] Ibid., pp. 45-47.

[41] Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 60.

[42] *Morning Courier and New York Enquirer*, February 20, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 64.

[43] Ibid., p. 64.

[44] *Morning Courier and New York Enquirer*, March 2, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, pp. 70-71.

[45] *Morning Courier and New York Enquirer*, March 9, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 75.

[46] Ibid., pp. 78-79.

[47] *Morning Courier and New York Enquirer*, March 15, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, pp. 82-83.

[48] *Morning Courier* and *New York Enquirer*, June 3, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, pp. 167-168.

[49] *Journal of Commerce*, May 22, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 145.

[50] Alfred Connable and Edward Silberfarb, *Tigers of Tammany* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), p. 114.

[51] Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 118.

[52] *The Subterranean*, May 15, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 137.

[53] *The Subterranean*, May 22, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 138.

[54] Ibid., p. 138.

[55] Ibid., p. 139.

[56] Ibid., p. 140.

[57] Ibid., p. 140.

[58] Ibid., p. 142.

[59] Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 147.

[60] *Daily Globe*, May 25, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, pp. 148-149.

[61] Ibid., p. 150.

[62] *The New York Herald*, May 31, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 163.

[63] *The New York Tribune*, June 2, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 60.

[64] *Evening Mirror*, June 8, 1847.

[65] *Journal of Commerce*, May 26, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 146.

[66] Ibid., p. 147.

[67] *Journal of Commerce*, May 26, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, pp. 155-156.

[68] *Commercial Advertiser*, June 5, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, pp. 174-175.

[69] *Evening Post*, June 5, 1847, p. 2.

[70] *Evening Post*, May 27, 1847, p. 2.

[71] *Journal of Commerce*, May 26, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 193.

[72] *Evening Post*, June 5, 1847, p. 2.

[73] Ibid., p. 2.

[74] Ibid., p. 2.

[75] Ibid., p. 2.

[76] Ibid., p. 2.

[77] *Subterranean*, June 12, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 212.

[78] *Daily Globe*, June 10, 1847, in Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 206.

[79] Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 186-190.

[80] *The New York Herald*, June 16,1847, p. 2.

[81] Carlton, *Economic Influences;* and Katz, *Irony*.

[82] Angus, "Detroit;" and Ravtich, *The Great School Wars*.

[83] Church, *Education*, pp. 61-81.

[84] A more precise form of analysis, such as multiple regression, was ruled out due to both the small number of cases and the limitations of ward level data.

[85] O.L. Holley, ed., *New York State Register for 1845-6* (New York: J. Disturnell, 1846), p. 487; D.T. Valentine, *Manual for the Corporation of the City of New York for 1848* (New York: McSpedon and Baker, 1849), pp. 318 and 406; D.T. Valentine, *Manual for the Corporation of the City of New York for 1849* (New York: McSpedon and Baker, 1850), pp. 210-212, 401, 406; *Census of the State of New York for 1845* (Albany: Carroll and Cook, 1846), pp. 29-1 to 29-5; *The New York Herald*, April 15, 1847, p. 2.

[86] Cosenza, *Free Academy*, p. 190.

[87] Katz, *Irony*, p. 31.

[88] Ibid., pp. 31-34.

[89] Lee Benson, *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 336.

[90] Ibid., p. 336.

[91] Ibid., p. 336.

[92] Church, *Education*, p. 61.

[93] Ibid., pp. 61-65.

[94] Ibid., pp. 61-81. The results also contradict statements in Benson's work, as well. While not central to his thesis, Benson argues that New York's Democrats of this era opposed expansion of public schools, which we have shown was clearly not the case in New York City in 1847.

[95] Katz, *Irony*, p. 49.

[96] Ibid., p. 214.

[97] Ibid., p. 80.

[98] Ibid., p. 53.

[99] Kaestle, *Evolution*, p. 106.

[100] Ibid., p. 107.

[101] Carlton, *Economic Influences*, p. 35.

Bibliography

Books

Benson, Lee. *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Carlton, Frank Tracy. *Economic Influences Upon Educational Progress in the United States, 1820-1850*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Church, Robert. *Education in the United States*. New York: The Free Press, 1976.

Connable, Alfred, and Silberfarb, Edward. *Tigers of Tammany*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Cosenza, Mario E. *The Establishment of the College of the City of New York as the Free Academy in 1847*. New York: The Associate Alumni of the College of the City of New York, 1925.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *Public Education in the United States*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1919.

Holley, O.L., ed. *New York State Register for 1845-46*. New York: J. Disturnell, 1846.

Kaestle, Carl. *The Evolution of the Urban School System*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Katz, Michael. *The Irony of Early School Reform*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Ravitch, Diane. *The Great School Wars*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Rudy, S. Willis. *The College of the City of New York: A History, 1847-1947*. New York: The City College Press, 1949.

Valentine, D.T. *Manual for the Corporation of the City of New York for 1848*. New York: McSpedon and Baker, 1849.

Valentine, D.T. *Manual for the Corporation of the City of New York for 1849*. New York: McSpedon and Baker, 1850.

Articles

Angus, David L., "Detroit's 'Great School Wars:' The School Politics of a Frontier City, 1836-1853." Unpublished paper presented at Teachers College, Columbia University, December 7-8, 1979.

Census

New York, *Census of the State of New York for 1845*. Albany: Carroll and Cook, 1846.

Newspapers

New York *Evening Mirror*, June 8, 1847.

New York *Evening Post*, May 27, 1847.

New York *Evening Post*, June 5, 1847.

New York Herald, April 15, 1847.

New York Herald, June 16, 1847.

A Note on the Occupational Backgrounds of Public High School Students Prior to 1940

Dr. David L. Angus
The University of Michigan

It is now axiomatic that over the course of the development of the American public high school student bodies became more and more representative of the population as a whole. It is also a commonplace that this occurred mostly within the period 1880 to 1930, and was closely linked to two other changes, the dramatic growth in high school enrollments and the introduction of a wide range of vocational and liberal course offerings which expanded the purposes and utility of the institution. While historians argue vehemently about how to interpret the meanings and value of these changes, the basic dimensions of the so-called "transformation" of the high school seem beyond dispute.[1]

Yet if one questions the empirical foundation on which this axiom rests, some surprises are in store. Consider first the sources which seem to be most often cited, Edward Krug's *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*, the Lynd's *Middletown*, and George Counts' classic study, *The Selective Character of American Secondary Education*.[2] Without detracting from the importance of Krug's work, it must be noted that it is not so much a study of the high school as a study of what people *said* about the high school. This is exemplified in his discussion of the social backgrounds of high school students. While treating the reader to a host of assertions made by educators that the high school was for the "masses" rather than the "classes" and was becoming "the plain people's college," he allows these claims to stand without evaluation and cites but two possible sources for empirical validation of them. Krug appears to tacitly accept the notion that rising enrollments inevitably produce a more representative student population.[3]

The Lynds' study of Muncie, Indiana in the early '20s is equally disappointing. Despite their emphasis on *class* differences in their discussion of the schools, no tabular data are presented, and their interviews seem to have focused on educational aspirations rather than on actual school attendance and performance. In general, they project the image of universal high school attendance, yet noting that some children do not attend and that the "economic status of a child's family" is a potent factor in this. In any case, even a careful analysis of the social backgrounds of the students of Muncie Central High School in 1923 would tell us nothing about *changes* over time.

Confusion about trends is also the most serious flaw in the one clearly empirical study that is often cited, Counts' *Selective Character*. . . . Counts studied four cities (St. Louis, Seattle, Bridgeport, Connecticut and Mt. Vernon, New York) with a combined high school enrollment of nearly 18,000 students. Students completed questionnaires in their classrooms while supervised by the teachers, guaranteeing nearly complete responses and a near 100 percent return rate. His analysis of the data was intelligently and carefully done and he developed a new system of categorizing occupations which was utilized by other researchers. Nevertheless his interpretation was badly flawed. He wrote about his findings as if longitudinal change could be inferred from cross-sectional data. His main conclusion was that while the high school was less "selective" in 1920 than it had been earlier, it remained an unrepresentative institution.

This error was noted, and yet committed again, in a little known replication of Counts' study carried out by three researchers in the U.S. Office of Education as part of a National Survey of Secondary Education in 1932. In what may have been the first attempt to establish trend data, Kefauver, Noll and Drake[4] examined whether or not the high schools in Seattle and Bridgeport had made "progress in democratization." They found that, in Seattle, the relative enrollments of upper- and lower-status children were more disparate than they had been 10 years earlier, while in Bridgeport there had been an "increasing democratization." Despite this mixed result, they assumed a model of long-term "democratization." In commenting on Counts' study, they say,

> It was undoubtedly true in 1920 when Counts made his study, and he implies in his report that the secondary school at that time was not so selective as it was in 1880. However, he had no data similar to his own with which direct comparison could be made.[5]

But *was* the high school student body more or less "democratic" in 1920 or 1930 than it had been in 1880, or at some earlier date in the 19th century? This becomes the central issue addressed in this paper. Other questions, related to this, also come to mind. Were researchers and/or educators interested in the occupational backgrounds of high school students before Counts? If so, why?, and what concepts of "class" are reflected in their thinking? How have data on the background of students been collected? How much variation is there from year to year? How much variation is there between cities or between regions? To what extent does community size affect the representativeness of the high school student body?

The Class Characteristics of the High School as a 19th Century "Problem"

Jeffrey Mirel, Carl Kaestle and others have shown that the question of

what "class" of students would attend the public high school was a major issue in the campaign and referendum for the New York Free Academy in 1847.[6] Subsequently, the trustees felt an obligation to report on this aspect of the school's enrollment, presenting in 1854 a list of the occupations of the parents of all students who had attended since its establishment. There were 139 separate occupations, listed in alphabetical order. The trustees suggested that it showed that the students "embrac[ed] all classes of citizens."[7] A few years later, similar data were again presented, this time in answer to the criticism that the school had become an exclusive monopoly of those who were well-off. Accompanying the data was a rebuttal which made these points: (1) entrance examinations were impartial and were carried out anonymously; (2) if poor children were "not as numerous as some might wish," it was because their parents could not "support them through the course;" (3) the school was not established "exclusively for the poor" and there was no reason why "more favored" children should not attend, especially since their parents paid "the main portion of the taxes;" and finally (4) few children in any community "avail themselves of the advantages of a collegiate course."[8] In New York, then, the Academy trustees were somewhat defensive about the proportion of students from the lower classes, but felt that the data were clear vindication.

Selwyn Troen has argued that the situation in St. Louis was quite different. Here Superintendent John Tice "believed that no system at all was possible without participation by the rich."[9] Beginning in 1854 and continuing through the '90s, the St. Louis *Annual Reports* included tables on the occupation of parents of the children in various schools. The difference in emphasis can be seen in the commentary accompanying the table for 1868:

> The results show that all classes are fairly represented. The conviction that the Public Schools excel all others in thoroughness and efficiency is the basis of this preference, as is shown by the fact that the patrons of the schools are found quite as often among the wealthy and influential classes as among those to whom tuition expenses are a consideration.[10]

In the northeastern region, both concerns are in evidence. Henry Barnard, an irrepressible collector of educators' opinions and observations, used some correspondence from high school principals to illustrate his contention that a good high school would "be regarded as the common property, the common glory, the common security of the whole community (124)." The principal of Boston's English High School described his students as "composed of what are called the middling classes of our city," and claimed that "the school is a perfect example of the poor and the rich, meeting on common ground and on terms quite

democratic." In Newburyport's High School for Girls, children from the "best families . . . sit side by side, . . . recite, and . . . associate most freely with those of the humblest parentage, whose widowed mothers, perhaps, toil day after day, at a washtub, without fear of contamination, or . . . a thought of the differences which exist." In Providence, the high school had met with "opposition"

> . . . because it was "aristocratic"
>
> . . . because it was unconstitutional to tax property for a city college
>
> . . . because it would educate children above working for their support
>
> . . . because a poor boy or girl would never be seen in it
>
> and for all such contradictory reasons.

But it had proven itself ". . . in bringing together the older and more advanced pupils, of either sex, from families of every profession, occupation and location in the city, . . ." In these cases, no data were presented, but where data were located, such as for the State of Maine, and the cities of Hartford and New Haven, Connecticut, similar claims were made.

Later in the century, it appears that criticisms were again leveled at the high school, this time in midwestern cities and states. In 1885, the Cleveland superintendent observed,

> It has often been said that high schools exist for the sake of the well-to-do and the rich; that the poor do not and cannot use them; and that their maintenance as a part of the public school system is an injustice.[12]

In 1889, the principal of Detroit High School remarked that "the old charge that the high school is the school for the rich has been made again this year."[13] Five years later, he again noted,

> It has been recently stated publicly that the high school is a class school and not the thoroughly democratic institution that the public schools must be if they are to receive public support.[14]

In these and similar cases, the answer put forth to the charge was a list of the occupations of the parents of high school pupils. These lists did not, as a rule, group occupations into "classes," and were arranged either alphabetically or by relative frequency.

Throughout the 19th century, then, educational administrators col-

lected and published information on the occupational backgrounds of high school students. They did this sometimes to demonstrate the presence of students from wealthy homes, but more often to show that "all classes and conditions of society" were represented. They were not, with rare exception, concerned with whether occupational groups were *proportionally* represented, but rather with whether a wide *variety* of occupations were to be found there. In those contexts I have found nothing that is even remotely related to our present concept of "equality of opportunity."

The Class Characteristics of the High School as a 20th Century "Problem"

After 1900, there was a remarkable shift of interest. I have not found a single example of occupational background data appearing in superintendents' reports later than 1897. It appears that educators' concerns shifted from the question of who attended the high school to the question of why so many failed to complete it or to complete enough schooling to enter it. Studies of "early withdrawal," of "retention" and of "retardation" became common and most of these were focused on students' attitudes rather than on their social backgrounds.[15]

There were, nonetheless, exceptions to this general trend, and it is in 1906 that we find an early attempt to test occupational background as a predictor of school attainment. Joseph K. VanDenburg, in a doctoral study carried out under the direction of Thorndyke at Columbia, came very close to producing a multi-variate analysis of high school withdrawal.[16] Consciously rejecting the idea that one could learn why students dropped out of high school by asking them, VanDenburg collected data on one thousand entering freshmen in 11 New York City high schools in 1906. Occupations of the parents of these students were collected and portrayed as part of his profile of these entering students, but this factor was not included in his analysis of their subsequent educational history. Instead, VanDenberg showed that monthly rental was not strongly associated with early withdrawal. Very few other researchers approached the subject in this way.

After 1910, another potential source of data on the backgrounds of high school students was the school system survey. The vast majority of these surveys were carried out by college and university professors of education, and the high school received particular attention in most of them. At least 570 such surveys were done between 1910-1920; yet our scanning of dozens of them turned up only two which contained useable data on the occupational backgrounds of high school students.[17]

With the publication of Counts' study in 1922, another shift occurred. First, as indicated earlier, his work spawned numerous imitators. We located eight studies which were clearly influenced by his, and there

could well have been many others, such as master's theses, which we failed to identify. Second, and more important, is the fact that Counts signals a far different standard of judgment from that applied in the 19th century. High school attendance is now *expected* to be universal and all occupational groups should be represented in proportion to their distribution in the relevant part of the work force in each city and town. His use of the term "selective character" strongly implies that it is the fault of the high school itself if proportionate representation is not achieved, rather than of economic or attitudinal factors outside the control of the school. In this sense then, the transformation of the *concept* of the high school, if not of the high school itself, was complete by 1922.

Before we leave the question of how 19th and early 20th century educators conceived the problem of the occupational backgrounds of high school students one other theme should be mentioned. Often we found that closely allied to statements about backgrounds were statements about the high school curriculum. One variant of the theme was that *because* the high school attracted students from working class homes which were likely unable to afford still further education, the high school curriculum should be made more practical and more closely related to specific occupations. A second variant started with the premise that the high school did not enroll and retain enough working class students and argued that this was because the curriculum was not sufficiently practical. A third variant suggested that the very presence in the high school of pupils from a wide range of social backgrounds showed that the high school curriculum was meeting a broad assortment of interests and needs. The really interesting point about these familiar arguments is their timelessness. They were offered up as early as the 1840's and were still being offered up in the 1940's and later.[18] For over a hundred years, then, images of the class composition of the high school student body have played key roles in curriculum reform struggles. These images have been constructed to serve ideological purposes and have been detached from "factual reality." It is appropriate to turn from this discussion of how educators and scholars conceived the "problem" of social backgrounds to an examination of what their own data reveals.

Evidence on the Class Characteristics of High School Students, 1849-1938

The following tables summarize the data we have found on the occupational backgrounds of high school students. They have been organized to suggest tentative answers to the questions posed above. Tables 1 and 2 portray chronologically the data from entire states and from cities and towns in a highly abstract form. Given wide variations in the level of detail and in the occupational categories in the original sources, we thought it best to recode into a few, broad groupings. Table 3, on St.

Louis, gives the best picture possible of longitudinal shifts in a single city. Here the categories in the original were only slightly recombined. Tables 4 and 5 consider variation in students' background as it relates to size of community and size of high school; the original categories were retained in each case. Table 6 compares the backgrounds of students in manual training and conventional high schools. Finally Table 7 summarizes a large group of studies which were influenced by George Counts and which utilized his occupational groupings.

Despite the obvious dangers involved in comparing different places at different times, Tables 1 and 2 suggest some tentative observations. First, some explanations are warranted. Great disparities in the figures in the "unclassified" columns are mainly the result of differing collection methods. In the earlier reports this category included orphans, widows, the unemployed and a few unclassifiable occupations. The children of widows with no occupation made up by far the largest share of this category. Later, researchers adopted the convention of collecting enough information to categorize these students by the former occupation of the deceased or divorced male family head, thus greatly reducing the unclassified percentage. Whether or not this was a wise procedure, it accounts for much of the variance across time. Another difference in the data representing states stems from what high schools are included. Early reports were based on incomplete returns of the state superintendents' annual surveys, while later studies relied on carefully constructed samples. Thus the fact that the percentage of Ohio high school students from farm backgrounds was only half what it was for Michigan at the same time is due not only to the fact that Ohio was somewhat more urbanized, but also because the city of Detroit was not included in the figures for Michigan.

Table 1 suggests to me that while modest differences in the distribution of the occupational backgrounds of high school students do exist, they are probably due more to differences in the occupational structure of states than to differences in time, in school policies, or in the total numbers of students enrolled. When cities and towns are compared, as in Table 2, variations in the pattern are much greater, but again, they seem not closely related to time period or total enrollment. St. Louis consistently reported extraordinarily high percentages from non-manual backgrounds, but the ratio was about the same for 1870 and 1921, and may be related to the pride which that city expressed in attracting the children or the wealthy into its public schools. Extraordinarily low percentages from non-manual backgrounds are reported in smaller cities and towns, but not all such places report low percentages. There is no support in either of these tables for the conventional view that as enrollments rose the student body became more heterogeneous.

Two objections might be made at this point. One is that given a city in

which the manual/non-manual ratio of students had remained relatively constant over, say, fifty years, the student body would nevertheless be more "representative" because of a long-term shift in the manual/non-manual ratio in the work force. It would take considerably more data than we have at present to test this out, but in any case it would seem a modest objection indeed if at the same time, high school enrollments had risen by several hundred percent. A second objection is that the assumed increase in manual class enrollment would be more apparent were we to combine public and private secondary school enrollments. In this view, the shift in enrollment from the academies to public secondary schools by presumably higher class children from 1850 to 1900 serves to mask real gains made by children from non-manual backgrounds. While there may prove to be considerable truth to this objection, it is a fundamentally different paradigm of high school development than that which prevails and it clearly does not apply to the most critical period, 1890-1930.

From about 1860 to 1897, statistics were collected in the St. Louis school system on the occupational backgrounds of the students. As displayed in these reports, the information was provided separately for each school, enabling us to focus specifically on high school students. The data from St. Louis provide an excellent opportunity to examine shifts in the occupational make-up of the high school over both short- and long-run periods. Table 3 displays data taken, for the most part, from these St. Louis reports. First, it shows that substantial year-to-year variation does occur, particularly when a change of policy or circumstance impacts upon the high school. The Civil War brought a sharp decline in total enrollment and a decline in the number of students from manual backgrounds. These changes were probably due to two causes, the reinstitution of a tuition charge to attend the high school and a rise in the job opportunities of teenage youth. By 1870, St. Louis High School had attained its pre-Civil War enrollment level and the children of manual workers had nearly recovered their earlier share of places. In the next five years, five branch high schools were established and enrollments more than tripled. Nonetheless, the occupational distribution of the students' parents remained virtually unchanged.

Over the next 20 years, St. Louis gave the nation two outstanding educational leaders, W.T. Harris and Calvin Woodward, and became a national leader itself in the manual training movement, establishing its oft-copied Polytechnic Institute in 1885. High school enrollments fell from their 1875 level, then rose more slowly throughout the period. Despite these changes, the share of high school places occupied by the children of non-manual workers rose slightly but steadily.

When George Counts surveyed St. Louis in 1920, high school enrollments had soared by 380 percent over the intervening quarter-century. The high schools had become, by all accounts, a mass terminal institu-

tion. Did they become more "democratic" with respect to occupational class? The most that can be argued is a 10 percent shift in favor of manual workers, and even this may be a statistical artifact. Counts would have been surprised to learn that the St. Louis high schools were no less "selective," in his terms, in 1920 than they had been in 1875!

From 1882 to 1886, the state superintendent of common schools in Ohio requested and received information on the parental occupations of students in Ohio high schools. Though the returns were spotty at first, perhaps due to confusion as to how the occupational categories were to be interpreted, the number of schools reporting gradually increased to 60 percent of all high schools in the state. Since the data from each high school was printed in the annual reports, they provide an opportunity to examine the relation between the size of communities and the occupational backgrounds of the high school students in those communities. The 1886 figures from Ohio are displayed in Table 4, and they suggest that high schools in small communities enrolled higher percentages of students from manual-class backgrounds. This is obviously true of farmers, but is also true when farmers are combined with mechanics and laborers. In terms of numbers of students, in all the years surveyed, more sons and daughters of mechanics and laborers attended high school in small communities than attended in large cities. This is important to note, since these small town high schools were far less likely to be offering the vocationally-oriented programs that educators and historians have claimed appealed to this strata.

Forty years later, Willis Uhl collected data on the occupational backgrounds of students in Wisconsin high schools, coding them into Counts' categories and stratifying them by the size of high schools. Table 5 displays Uhl's data.[19] The most obvious difference between columns, as it was in the Ohio case, is the percentage of children from farm backgrounds. However, as this percentage declines, the remaining "places" are distributed proportionally between manual and non-manual students in high schools in the 200-499 range, disproportionally in favor of manual class students in the 500-999 range, then wildly disproportionally in favor of non-manual students in the three high schools enrolling 1,000 or more students. This strongly suggests that while high schools in the largest urban places[20] were clearly "selective" in Counts' terms, student bodies in smaller high schools were much more broadly representative and may well have been from their beginnings.

Earlier we noted that educators have commonly linked discussions of the social composition of high schools to discussions of curriculum reform. To the degree that high schools emphasized the college preparatory function, they were assumed to best serve the needs of upper status students. The concept of the high school as a terminal, vocational institution was supported by the idea of service to a larger and more broadly

representative student body. In the 1880's and '90s, the strongest expression of this latter concept was the manual training movement. Data from St. Louis, 1885-1893, provide an opportunity to test whether a "polytechnic" high school attracted a student body which was different in social background from that of a conventional high school. Table 6 displays these data, and it is clear at a glance that the distributions in the two high schools are virtually identical. Perhaps similar data from a later period would show divergence in the predicted direction;[21] this would seem to be a particularly fruitful area for further research. From this Table, we can only conclude that high school grade technical training was *not* more attractive to lower-status students than the conventional curriculum.

Finally, I wish to focus on a few studies which provide a more elaborate display of occupational categories. Most of these were directly influenced by the work of George Counts. The early data from Connecticut were recoded into Counts' categories by Silas Hertzler from original records in which the occupational designations were suitably detailed. The data for Wilmington, Delaware, and Elyria, Ohio, were recoded by the author. All the other studies used Counts' system from the beginning, though the students studied by Mueller had actually attended high school in a period prior to Counts' study. The data in this Table are probably far more reliable than that shown in Tables 1 and 2; yet the results are not far different. Again, it seems clear that the greatest variation occurs in the category "agricultural," and that this varies more by size of place than by time. There is no clear trend toward a higher representation in the high school population of children from manual-class backgrounds, even though the period of the high school's most rapid transformation to a terminal institution. Children from the lowest occupational groupings are conspicuously absent, but this was no less true in the '20s and '30s than it was much earlier.

As before, it seems clear that variations between the types of communities under study are more significant than variations over time. A comment made by R. Ernest Dear, when he compared his findings on Michigan towns to those of Uhl and Counts, seems to apply equally to this broader comparison.

> The variations among these communities might probably be explained by the differences in their industries rather than by the factor of sociological selection. This raises a question as to whether there is such a thing as sociological selection in the high-school population of small communities.[22]

Conclusions

This brief examination of the "scanty evidence" on the occupational

backgrounds of public high school students sharply challenges the prevailing views of most historians of the high school.[23] While it proves almost nothing, it should serve to cast doubt on the prevailing paradigm and encourage scholars to undertake the careful case studies that will be needed to construct a new one. It *is* possible to reconstruct the occupational distribution of individual high schools from school records, city directories, and census manuscripts where such sources are available. Unfortunately, these requirements contain a strong urban bias, at least for the period after 1900. It may not be possible to fully test one hypothesis that is strongly suggested by these data, that high schools in small communities were more proportionally representative of their population than were high schools in cities.

One final observation seems warranted. The connections which educators have perenially drawn between the size and composition of the student body and the curriculum seem quite ephemeral in the face of these data. The rhetoric of curriculum reform efforts has obscured our vision of how the high school actually served the purposes of those youth who used it in increasing numbers. This question remains of vital importance in the determination of educational policy, both in the United States where the fundamental purposes of the high school continue to be debated, and in third world countries where educational planners make assumptions rooted in the presumed educational experiences of more advanced countries.

Notes

[1] For example, compare Edward Krug's *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969) with Paul Violas' *The Training of the Urban Working Class: A History of Twentieth Century American Education* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978).

[2] Krug, *op. cit.*, Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, *Middletown: A Study in American Culture* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1929), Ch. XIII; George S. Counts, *The Selective Character of American Secondary Education*, Supplementary Educational Monograph No. 19, 1922 (Chicago: University of Chicago School of Education, 1922), p. 26.

[3] Krug, pp. 11-14, and Chapter 8.

[4] Grayson N. Kefauver, Victor H. Noll, and C. Elwood Drake, *The Secondary-School Population*, U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1932, No. 17 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1933).

[5] Ibid., p. 11.

[6] Jeffrey Mirel, "A Matter of Means: The Campaign and Election for the New York Free Academy, 1847-1848," unpublished manuscript, 1980; Carl Kaestle, *The Evolution of an Urban School System: New York City, 1750-1850*

(Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 107; Mario E. Cosenza, *The Establishment of the City College of New York as the Free Academy in 1847* (New York: The Associate Alumni of the College of the City of New York, 1925).

[7] New York, Board of Education, *Twelfth Annual Report, 1854* (New York: The Board, 1854), p. 107.

[8] New York, Board of Education, *Fourteenth Annual Report, 1856* (New York: The Board, 1956), p. 43.

[9] Selwyn K. Troen, *The Public and the Schools: Shaping the St. Louis System, 1838-1920* (Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1973), p. 14.

[10] St. Louis, Board of Education, *Fourteenth Annual Report, 1868* (St. Louis: Knapp and Co., Printers, 1969), p. 60.

[11] Henry Barnard, *Practical Illustrations of the Principles of School Architecture* (no imprint, no date), pp. 126-127.

[12] Cleveland Board of Education, *Forty-Ninth Annual Report, 1885* (Cleveland: Printed at the Publishing House of the Evangelical Association, 1886), p. 99.

[13] Detroit, Board of Education, *Forty-Sixth Annual Report, 1889* (Detroit: James Markey Printer, 1889), p. 52.

[14] Detroit, Board of Education, *Fifty-First Annual Report, 1894* (Detroit: Detroit Publishing Co., Printers, 1894), p. 105.

[15] Such studies are too numerous to list. One of the earliest and most often cited by others was E.L. Thorndyke, *The Elimination of Pupils from Schools*, U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1907, No. 4 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1907).

[16] Joseph K. VanDenBurg, *Causes of Elimination of Students in Public Secondary Schools of New York City*, Contributions to Education, No. 47 (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1911).

[17] See Henry Lester Smith and Edgar Alvin O'Dell, *Bibliography of School Surveys and of References on School Surveys*, Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, VIII, No. 1, 2 (Bloomington, Ind.: Bureau of Cooperative Research, Indiana University, 1931).

[18] For the 1840's see Mirel and Cosenza, op. cit. A much later example:

> It is obvious that the same curricula are not suited to all youth in the secondary school and that the academic subjects appropriate to the selected group of youth attending high school in the nineteenth century are inadequate educational materials for the mass of youth in the modern secondary school.

J. Paul Leonard, *Developing the Secondary School Curriculum* (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1946), p. vii.

[19] I have checked Uhl's sampling frame by determining the total number of high schools in Wisconsin in each size classification and calculating the percent represented in Uhl's sample. The smallest high schools are undersampled (19 percent) while those in the 500-999 range are overrepresented (60 percent).

[20] Uhl's sample included three out of ten high schools enrolling over 1,000 students. Five of these ten were in Milwaukee. The others were in Appleton, LaCrosse, Madison, Oshkosh, and Wausau. There is no way to know from which three Uhl collected data.

[21] I was also able to code the occupational backgrounds of students in the Toledo Manual Training High School in 1886 and compare this to data on Central High School from the Ohio Superintendent's Report. Here, the comparison was even more remarkable in that the ratio of non-manual to manual in the manual training school was 83 percent to 17 percent compared to a ratio of 55 percent to 45 percent in the conventional high school.

[22] R. Ernest Dear, "Distribution and Persistence According to Paternal Occupations Represented in the Secondary Schools in Michigan," *Journal of Educational Research*, XXVI (April, 1963), p. 389.

[23] Christopher Jencks and David Riesman found, to their surprise, that when college enrollments more than doubled between 1950 and 1965, "the increase in enrollment among upper-middle class children seems to have been even greater than among lower-middle and working-class children." *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968), p. 95.

Table 1

Percent Distribution of the Occupational Backgrounds of High School Students in Selected States: 1868-1938

State	Date	n	*Farmer* %	*Manual* %	*Non-Manual* %	*Unclassified* %
Connecticut[1]	1868	1,576	17	52	30	1
Maine[2]	1879		61		19	20
Ohio[3]	1882	8,169	11	31	34	24
Ohio	1883	11,258	13	32	31	24
Ohio	1884	12,387	14	32	31	22
Ohio	1885	13,932	14	31	30	25
Ohio	1886	15,866	17	34	30	19
Michigan[4]	1883	2,796	35	26	17	22
Michigan	1884	5,092	28	28	18	26
Wisconsin[5]	1923	19,687	29	34	31	6
Pennsylvania[6]	1928 (?)	27,219	9	43	44	4
Maryland[7]	1938	8,239	20	46	30	4

Table 1
Sources

[1]Silas Hertzler, *The Rise of the Public High School in Connecticut* (Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1930), 199.

[2]State of Maine, *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools*, 1879, 10-11.

[3]State of Ohio, *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools*, 1882-1886.

[4]State of Michigan, *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction*, 1883, xxxix; 1884, x.

[5]Willis L. Uhl, *Principles of Secondary Education: A Textbook for Students of Education* (New York: Silver Burdett and Co., 1925), 215, 217.

[6]Margaret Whiteside Moore, *A Study of Young High School Graduates*, Contributions to Education, No. 583 (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933), 14.

[7]Howard M. Bell, *Youth Tell Their Story* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938), 60-61.

Table 2

Percent Distribution of the Occupational Background of High School Students in Selected Cities and Towns, 1849-1932

Place	Dates	n	*Manual* %	*Non-Manual* %	*Unclassified* %
New York Free Academy[1]	1849-1853	990	38 (49)	39 (51)	23
Somerville, Mass.[2]	1856-1861	111	34 (38)	57 (62)	9
St. Louis[3]	1860	387	27 (36)	49 (64)	24
New York Free Academy[4]	1863	364	37 (43)	49 (57)	14
Hartford[5]	1868-1872	651	45 (47)	50 (53)	5
St. Louis	1870	391	28 (33)	56 (67)	16
St. Louis	1880	943	23 (27)	60 (73)	17
Hartford[6]	1884	201	42 (46)	50 (54)	8
East Saginaw, Mich.[7]	1887	273	53 (60)	36 (40)	11
Detroit[8]	1889	633	29 (34)	58 (66)	13
Bay City, Mich.[9]	1890	293	42 (46)	50 (54)	8
Adrian, Mich.[10]	1890	151	47 (54)	40 (46)	13
St. Louis	1890	1,118	18 (25)	57 (75)	25
Detroit	1894	1,225	25 (32)	54 (68)	20
St. Louis	1895	1,565	18 (23)	62 (77)	20
New Haven, Conn.[11]	1899	707	36 (46)	42 (54)	22

New York City[12]	1906	785	34 (44)	43 (56)	23
Wilmington, Del.[13]	1918	820	49	51	
Elyria, Ohio[14]	1918	590	58 (63)	34 (37)	8
Seattle[15]	1920	6,387	39 (41)	57 (59)	4
Bridgeport, Conn.	1921	2,257	43 (44)	54 (56)	3
St. Louis	1921	7,537	33 (34)	64 (66)	3
Mt. Vernon, New York	1921	1,084	23 (24)	74 (76)	3
Spokane, Wash.[16]	1922	1,362	41 (46)	48 (54)	11
Eight Michigan Cities[17]	1930	1,722	62 (71)	25 (29)	13
Seattle[18]	1931	13,061	39	61	
Bridgeport, Conn.	1931	4,790	47	53	
Eleven Southern Cities[19]	1932	20,593	40 (43)	52 (57)	8

Table 2
Sources:

[1]Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1854, pp. 13-14. Also cited in Carl F. Kaestle, *The Evolution of an Urban School System: New York City, 1750-1850* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 107.

[2]Cited in Michael Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 271.

[3]Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

[4]Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1864, pp. 17-18.

[5]Silas Hertzler, *The Rise of the Public High School in Connecticut* (Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1930), p. 199.

[6]*Annual Report of the Board of Education of the State of Connecticut Presented to the General Assembly, January Session, 1886* (New Haven: Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor, 1886), pp. 198-202.

[7]*East Saginaw Public Schools, 1882-1887* (East Saginaw, Mich.: Saginaw, Herald Printers and Binders, 1887), p. 65.

[8]Detroit Board of Education, *Forty-Sixth Annual Report, 1889* (Detroit: James Markey, Printer, 1889), p. 54; and *Fifty-First Annual Report, 1894* (Detroit: Detroit Publishing Co., 1894), pp. 107-109.

[9]Bay City, Michigan, *Public Schools Annual Report, 1889-90* (Bay City, Mich.: Published by order of the Board of Education, 1890), p. 23.

[10]*Public Schools of the City of Adrian, 1886-90* (Adrian, Mich.: Times and Expositor Steam Print, 1890), pp. 96-7.

[11]New Haven, Connecticut, Board of Education, *Annual Report 1899* (New Haven: The Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor Press, 1899), pp. 71-73.

[12]Joseph K. VanDenBerg, *Causes of Elimination of Students in Public Secondary Schools of New York City* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1911), pp. 40-43.

[13]U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, *Industrial Education in Wilmington, Delaware*, Bulletin No. 25 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918).

[14]U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, *Educational Survey of Elyria, Ohio*, Bulletin No. 15 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918).

[15]The 1920-21 data are from George S. Counts, *The Selective Character of American Secondary Education*, Supplementary Educational Monograph, No. 19, 1922 (Chicago: University of Chicago School of Education, 1922), p. 26; the 1930 data are from Kefauver, Knoll and Drake, *The Secondary School Population*, U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17, Monograph No. 4 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1933), p. 13.

[16]Paul F. Gaiser, "Occupation Representation in High School," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, IX (December, 1923).

[17]R. Ernest Dear, "Distribution and Persistence According to Paternal Occupations Represented in the Secondary Schools in Michigan," *Journal of Educational Research*, XXVI, 8 (April, 1933), pp. 585-592. The cities are Ironwood, Marquette, Sault Sainte Marie, Traverse City, Escanada, Benton Harbor, Monroe, and Owosso.

[18]Kefauver, Noll, and Drake, *op. cit.*

[19]Floyd Jordan, *The Social Composition of the Secondary Schools of the Southern States*, George Peabody Contributions to Education, No. 108 (Nashville, Tenn.: George Peabody College of Education, 1933), pp. 48-49. The cities included are Montgomery, Jacksonville, Atlanta, Lexington, New Orleans, Winston-Salem, Nashville, Jackson, Mississippi, Columbia, South Carolina, Beaumont, Texas, and Norfolk, Virginia.

Percent Distribution of the Occupational Backgrounds of High School Students: St. Louis, 1860-1920

Occupational Group[1]	1860	1861	1862	1867	1870	1875	1880	1885	1890	1895[2]	1920[3]
Professionals	6	10	11	14	13	12	12	15	10	11	9
Merchants and Manufacturers	29	29	36	19	25	26	28	26	23	24	38
Agents, Clerks, & Public Officials	13	15	14	8	17	12	19	20	23	26	19
"Keepers"	1	1		1	1	3	1	1	1	1	
Non-Manual	49	55	61	42	56	52	60	62	57	62	66
Mechanics	8	16	7	3	18	17	14	15	13	12	23
Semi-Skilled Workers	7	4	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	5
Laborers and Domestics	7	7	4	4	3	3	4	2	2	3	2
Farmers	5	4	3	1	4	3	2	2	1	1	1
Manual	27	31	15	10	28	27	22	22	18	18	31
Unclassified	24	15	25	48	16	21	17	16	25	20	3
TOTAL:	100	101	101	100	100	100	99	100	100	100	100
[TOTAL]:	(387)	(318)	(229)	(353)	(391)	(1287)	(943)	(949)	(1468)	(1967)	(7537)

[1]Some recombining of the categories in the original was done as follows: "Professionals" includes "artists;" "Keepers" combines "Barkeepers, Hotelkeepers, and Boardinghouse Keepers;" "Semi-skilled Workers" combines "Boatmen," "Butchers," "Draymen," and "Confectioners;" "Farmers" includes "gardeners."

[2]Includes the Normal School, but this group constituted only a little more than one hundred of the nearly two thousand students.

[3]This column is derived from George S. Counts, *The Selective Character of American Secondary Education*, Supplementary Educational Monograph, No. 19, 1922 (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago School of Education, 1922).

Table 4

Distribution of Occupational Backgrounds of High School Students by Size of Community: Ohio, 1886

Community Size	*# of High Schools Reporting*	*# of Students*	*Professional*	*Merchant*	*Small Tradesmen*	*Total Non-Manual*	*Mechanics & Laborers*	*Farmers*	*Total Manual*	*Unclassified*
	n	n	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Under 2500	169	7168	9	11	5	25	32	27	60	16
2500-10000	59	4528	12	16	7	35	32	12	44	22
10001-35000	8	1154	10	15	8	33	39	7	46	21
Over 35000	4	3016	10	14	9	33	42	2	44	24
Total:	**240**	**15866**	**10**	**13**	**7**	**30**	**34**	**17**	**51**	**19**

Source: *Thirty-Third Annual Report of the State Commissioner of Common Schools, State of Ohio, 1886* (Columbus: Myers Bros., State Printers, 1887), pp. 152-175.

Percentage Distribution of Occupational Backgrounds of High School Students by Size of High School: Wisconsin, 1923

	Under 100	*100-199*	*200-499*	*500-999*	*1,000 or More*
Number of High Schools:	43	31	17	8	3
Number of Students:	2771	3808	4608	4936	3493
Occupational Backgrounds	%	%	%	%	%
Proprietors	11	11	12	10	14
Professional Service	4	3	5	5	8
Managerial Service	4	3	6	7	14
Commercial Service	2	3	5	7	12
Clerical Service	1	0	2	2	6
Agricultural Service	54	53	29	15	2
Artisan-Proprietors	3	3	3	3	5
Building Trades	3	3	4	6	7
Machine Trades	2	2	4	10	8
Printing Trades	0	0	0	0	1
Miscellaneous Trades	3	2	6	4	2
Transportation Service	3	2	4	8	4
Public Service	0	1	1	2	2
Personal Service	1	1	1	2	1
Miners, Lumbermen, Fishermen	0	1	3	1	0
Common Labor	7	7	11	12	8
Unknown	3	5	5	6	5
Home Service	1	1	1	1	2

Source: Willis L. Uhl, *Principles of Secondary Education: A Textbook for Students of Education* (New York: Silver Burdett and Co., 1925), pp. 215, 217.

Table 5

Table 6

Comparison of the Occupational Backgrounds of High School Students in Manual Training & Conventional High Schools: St. Louis, 1885-1893

Occupational Group	Central High School		Polytechnic High School	
	n	%	n	%
Professionals	683	13 [16]*	588	9 [12]
Merchants & Manufacturers	1322	25 [30]	1495	24 [32]
Agents, Clerks, and Public Officials	1275	24 [29]	1484	24 [31]
"Keepers"	60	1 [1]	85	1 [2]
Non-Manual	3340	62 [77]	3652	59 [77]
Mechanics	658	12 [15]	647	10 [14]
Semi-Skilled Workers	132	2 [3]	150	2 [3]
Laborers and Domestics	164	3 [4]	214	3 [5]
Farmers	59	1 [1]	73	1 [2]
Manual	1013	19 [23]	1084	17 [23]
Unclassified	1004	19	1468	24
Total:	**5357**	**100**	**6204**	

Source: St. Louis, Board of Education, *Forty-Second Annual Report, 1896* (St. Louis: Nixon-Jones Printing Co., 1897), p. 74.

*Percentages in brackets are calculated excluding "unclassified."

Percent Distribution of High School Population by Occupation of Father, Comparison of Eleven Studies, 1868-1932

Occupational Group	Connecticut 1868[1]	Hartford 1868-1872[2]	26 Small New England H.S. 1910-1914[3]	Wilmington, Del. 1918[4]	Elyria, Ohio 1918[5]	Four Cities 1919-1920[6]	Wisconsin 1923[7]	Pennsylvania 1928 [?][8]	8 Small Mich. Cities, 1930[9]	Two Cities 1931[10]	11 Southern Cities, 1932[11]
Proprietors	16	24	12	17	7	20	11	15	5	20	17
Professionals	6	13	5	6	9	9	5	7	2	9	8
Managerial	3	4	8	15	11	17	7	12	10	13	8
Commercial	4	6	3	10	3	10	6	6	7	10	15
Clerical	1	3	1	4	5	6	2	5	2	5	4
Non-Manual	(30)	(50)	(29)	(52)	(35)	(62)	(31)	(45)	(26)	(57)	(52)
Agricultural	17	14	38	5	20	2	29	9	11		4
Artisan/Propr.	5	8	5	2	3	4	3		2		3
Building Trades	9	10	5	10	8	8	5	8	10	5	5
Machine Trades	16	6	5	9	14	8	5	10	12	12	4
Printing Trades	1	2				1	1	1	1	1	1
Misc. Trades	4	2	4	7	3	4	3	5	3	5	1
Transportation	5	3	4	7	6	5	4	6	9	7	10
Public Service	1	1	4	3		2	1	1	2	3	9
Pers. Service	3	1	1		3	1	1	1	2	3	1
Miners, Lumber			1				1	5	5	2	2
Common Labor	9		5	4	1	1	9	6	4	5	1
Manual	(69)	(45)	(71)	(47)	(58)	(35)	(62)	(52)	(61)	(43)	(40)
Unknown	1	5			8	3	6	4	13		8
[Total]	[1576]	[651]	[628]	[820]	[590]	[17265]	[19687]	[27219]	[2748]	[17863]	[20593]

Table 7

Table 7
Sources:

[1]Silas Hertzler, *The Rise of the Public High School in Connecticut* (Baltimore: Warwick & York, Inc., 1930), p. 199.

[2]Ibid.

[3]A.D. Mueller, "A Vocational and Socio-Educational Survey of Graduates and Non-Graduates of Small High Schools of New England," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, VI, 4 (October, 1929), p. 340.

[4]U.S. Bureau of Education, *Industrial Education in Wilmington, Delaware*, Bulletin, No. 25 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918).

[5]U.S. Bureau of Education, *Educational Survey of Elyria, Ohio*, Bulletin, No. 15 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918).

[6]Seattle, St. Louis, Bridgeport, Connecticut, and Mount Vernon, New York, from Counts.

[7]Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools, State of Maine, 1879, pp. 10-11.

[8]Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools, State of Ohio, 1882-1885.

[9]R. Ernest Dear, "Distribution and Persistence According to Paternal Occupations Represented in the Secondary Schools in Michigan," *Journal of Educational Research* XXVI, No. 8 (April, 1936), 591.

[10]Seattle and Bridgeport, from Kefauver, Noll and Drake.

[11]Floyd Jordan, *The Social Composition of the Secondary Schools of the Southern States*, George Peabody Contributions to Education, No. 108 (Nashville, Tenn.: George Peabody College of Education, 1933), pp. 48-49. The cities included are Montgomery, Jacksonville, Atlanta, Lexington, New Orleans, Winston-Salem, Nashville, Jackson, Mississippi, Columbia, South Carolina, Beaumont, Texas, and Norfolk, Virginia.

PART IV

Program and Proceedings

PROGRAM

The Midwest History of Education Society
1980 Annual Meeting Program
Loyola University of Chicago
Lewis Towers Campus
820 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Friday, 24 October 1980
Saturday, 25 October 1980

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1980

Noon-1 p.m. REGISTRATION (Regis Room)

Rosemary Donatelli
Loyola University of Chicago

1:00-4:00 p.m. FIRST SESSION (Regis Room)
History of Higher Education

Charles M. Dye, Chairman
The University of Akron

Gregory A. Sprague
Loyola University of Chicago
The University of Illinois' Long Search For A Permanent Campus In Chicago, 1946-1963: The Relationship Between The Politics of Influence and the Conflicting Images of an Urban University

Marlene Hathaway
The University of Michigan
Between Two Worlds: The Residential College at the University of Michigan

Sheldon S. Cohen
Loyola University of Chicago
Maroon Farewell: The Abolition of Intercollegiate Football at the University of Chicago

1:00-4:00 p.m. SECOND SESSION (Room TBA)
Educational Thought

William E. Eaton, Chairman
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

David B. Owen
The University of Chicago
William Rainey Harper: Christian Individualism and the University of Chicago

Timothy Reagan
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Deschooling Revisited: An Examination of Ivan Illich's Social Thought

Robert Newton Barger
Eastern Illinois University
John Lancaster Spalding: The Horace Mann of Catholic Education

4:15-5:00 p.m. THIRD SESSION (Regis Room)
Round Table Discussion: The History of Education in the Midwest: Perspectives and Prospects

James C. Carper, Chairman
Tulane University

Charles M. Dye
The University of Akron

David L. Angus
The University of Michigan

William E. Eaton
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

5:00-5:30 p.m. ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING (Regis Room)

The Midwest History of Education Society Officers

President
Charles M. Dye
The University of Akron

Vice-President/Program Chairman
James C. Carper
Tulane University

Secretary
David W. Adams
Cleveland State University

Editor, *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society*
Edward Rutkowski
The University of Northern Iowa

5:30-6:30 p.m. SOCIAL HOUR (President's Room)

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1980

9:00-Noon FOURTH SESSION (Regis Room)
Education and Reform

David W. Adams, Chairman
Cleveland State University

Nancy M. Sheehan
The University of Calgary
The WCTU and Education: Canadian-American Illustrations

Jeffrey Mirel
The University of Michigan
The Matter of Means: The Campaign and Election for the New York Free Academy, 1846-1847

David L. Angus
The University of Michigan
A Note on the Occupational Backgrounds of Public High School Students Prior to 1940

Noon — ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES: 1980 ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO FRIDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1980

The annual business meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society convened at 5:00 P.M., 24 October 1980, Friday, in the Regis Room of the Loyola University of Chicago. The meeting was called to order by Society President, Charles M. Dye.

The minutes of the 1979 annual business meeting were read by Society Secretary David W. Adams and approved unanimously.

Edward Rutkowski reviewed the financial status of the *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society* and reported that rising printing costs required that the *Journal* be raised to $4.00 per issue. He also reported that a ten year anniversary index issue was in preparation and that application had been made to Phi Delta Kappan for a $200.00 grant to defer publication costs for the special issue. It was also announced that the 1980 issue of the Journal would be dedicated to Rosemary Donatelli, whose death was deeply felt by the Society's members.

The following were nominated, seconded, and elected by acclamation as officers in the Society for 1981:

President:	James C. Carper Tulane University
Vice President:	David W Adams Cleveland State University
Secretary:	David L. Angus University of Michigan

As program chairperson for 1980, James C. Carper reported that twenty-nine papers had been submitted from which nine were finally selected. The number of submissions was a marked increase over the previous year and appeared to indicate the Society's increased visibility.

Members of the Society expressed their deep appreciation to Gerald Gutek, Charles Samec, and Kay Smith of Loyola for their efforts in hosting the 1980 meeting. The Society accepted an invitation to hold the Seventeenth annual meeting at Loyola University of Chicago, 30-31 October, 1981.

Members of the Society expressed appreciation to David W. Adams

for his efforts to create an attractive program brochure.

The society discussed the desirability of exploring ways in which members of the Society might share research interests and findings on various aspects of midwest educational history with their colleagues at other institutions. It was then moved, seconded, and approved that the President, James C. Carper, appoint a committee toward this purpose.

The membership then expressed its appreciation to Edward Rutkowski for his work and dedication as editor of the *Journal* and to the officers for their efforts in making the 1980 meeting a success.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Adams, Secretary
The Midwest History of
Education Society

DIRECTORY OF ATTENDANCE

David Adams
Cleveland St. University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

John Shin-ichi AIURA
Loyola University
Department of Education
820 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

David L. Angus
4118 S.E.B.
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

James Anderson
366 Education Building
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Robert Barger
2519 Village Road
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Joseph Bartley III
3027 North Bigelow Street
Peoria, Illinois 61604

Bob Belding
5-A QCC
North Liberty, Iowa 52317

James C. Carper
Department of Education
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Stephen M. Colby
5737 S. Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Harold B. Dunkel
5737 South Kenwood
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Charles M. Dye
2999 Chamberlain Road
Akron, Ohio 44313

William Eaton
2914 Kent
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

William O. Farley
1230 Center Apt. 5
Marquette, Michigan 49855

Janet Fredericks
7853 N. Kilboren
Skokie, Illinois 60076

Marcel Fredericks
7853 N. Kilboren
Skokie, Illinois 60076

Gerald L. Gutek
School of Education
Loyola University
820 N. Michigan
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Marlene C. Hathaway
2124 Glencoe Hills Drive #8
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

James H. King
518 Park Avenue
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

J. Randolph Kirby
519 W. Washington Blvd.
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46802

George Knight
505 Meadowview Court
Berrien Springs, Maine 49103

Dr. Mark Krug
Loyola University
Lewis Towers
820 N. Michigan
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Norlene M. Kunkel
St. Mary's College, Box 76
Winona, Minnesota 55987

Robert M. Lang
211 Hartford Drive
Schaumburg, Illinois 60193

Alex Makedon
400 Maynard Street, Apt. 603
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Robert L. McCaul
5835 South Kimbark
Judd Hall
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Donald J. McGuire
305 South Hale
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

Jeffrey Mirel
3064 Dexter Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

Judith Nogilka
360 Education Building
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois 61801

David B. Owen
1154 Heather Lane
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Eben O. Palmquist
5S731 Ridgevlen Lane
Naperville, Illinois 60540

Timothy Reagan
360 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

David Ripley
329 Graham Hall
Northern Illinois University
Leps Department
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

Edward Rutkowski
513 Education Center
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Charles E. Samec
614 S. Clarence Avenue
Oak Park, Illinois 60304

Nancy Sheehan
908 Education Tower
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Kay Smith
Loyola University of Chicago
820 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Sam R. Snyder
616 Tennyson Place
Toledo, Ohio 43620

Gregory Sprague
1437 Lunt #1-N
Chicago, Illinois 60626

Paul C. Violas
375 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Miss Susan Mary Ward
Chateau Richelieu 109A
4900 N. Knoxville Avenue
Peoria, Illinois 61600

201